



County of Los Angeles CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

March 20, 2012

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

**APPROVE THE 2011 LOS ANGELES COUNTY CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT
NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND 2012 GEOGRAPHIC PRIORITIES FOR EXPANSION OF
SUBSIDIZED CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
(ALL DISTRICTS) (3-VOTES)**

SUBJECT

Local child care planning councils, funded by the California Department of Education (CDE), are required to complete a Countywide child care needs assessment at least once every five years and, on an annual basis, to determine geographic priorities for the expansion of subsidized child care services. Both documents are to be approved by the County Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Supervisors (Board) prior to submission to CDE. The Los Angeles County Child Care Planning Committee, in conjunction with the Chief Executive Office, is submitting the 2011 Los Angeles County Child Care and Development Needs Assessment (Needs Assessment), and the 2012 Los Angeles County Geographic Priorities for Child Care and Development Services (Priorities Report) for approval by the Board of Supervisors.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Approve the 2011 Needs Assessment (Attachment I).
2. Approve the 2012 Los Angeles County Geographic Priorities for Child Care and Development Services and authorize the Chief Executive Officer, or his designee, to sign the Priorities Report (Attachment II). The Office of Child Care (OCC) will submit the signed report to CDE.

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"

***Please Conserve Paper – This Document and Copies are Two-Sided
Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only***

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

Pursuant to State requirements, formal approval by your Board and by the County Superintendent of Schools is needed before submitting the Needs Assessment and the Priorities to the CDE. The Education Code 8499.5 requires local planning councils in each county to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment at least every five years. The last Needs Assessment for Los Angeles County was completed in 2006. An approved 2011 Needs Assessment Report ensures compliance with the regulations.

Priorities are reviewed more frequently and after each needs assessment to determine if circumstances have changed to create new or different areas of need. The results are compiled in the Priorities report required by CDE.

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

Approval of the Needs Assessment and Priorities Reports supports Goal 2 of the County's Strategic Plan: Children, Family and Adult Well-Being to enrich lives through integrated, cost-effective and client-centered supportive services. The information available in these reports will assist both County personnel and community based organizations in addressing the most pressing needs for child care and development services for County clients and the general public.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

CDE contracts require and fund the data collection efforts needed to complete the Countywide child care needs assessment and priority setting processes. Approval by your Board of these documents is needed to fulfill contract requirements. There is no direct fiscal impact to the County in approving these documents.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

To comply with all statute and Education Code requirements, the Needs Assessment included data on: all children ages zero through 12 in working families; children zero through 12 in low-income working families; and low-income three and four year olds. It also included data on services for CalWORKS families and the number of children in Child Protective Services.

The process for approving the Needs Assessment and the Priorities Report includes not only your Board's approval, but also that of the Superintendent of Schools. Dr. Arturo Delgado has indicated his approval on the endorsement form attached (Attachment III). In addition the needs assessment and priorities were presented to the Planning Committee on December 7, 2011 where they were both approved. A public hearing on the Priorities is required by statute. The public hearing was held on January 11, 2012, at the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. There was general agreement with the findings of the Needs Assessment and the Priorities Report and those present offered several recommendations which have been incorporated into the final Needs Assessment document.

- *Child Care and Development Needs Assessment*

The *2011 Los Angeles County Child Care and Development Needs Assessment* is the result of efforts of the Los Angeles County Child Care Planning Committee and the Early Care and Education Data Collaboration (ECE Data Collaboration). The ECE Data Collaboration is composed of a representative from OCC on behalf of the Planning Committee, Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) Head Start/State Preschool, and Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP). Each of the ECE Data Collaboration members operates under specific requirements that include the periodic review of conditions related to the need for child care and development services. In previous years, each group had conducted its own assessment and analysis independently and the results of these efforts have sometimes proved confusing. Partners of the ECE Data Collaboration came together in 2010 to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment that would address both the overall picture of child care and development service availability in the County and the service needs of specific populations of concern to each partner.

Some of the key findings of the Los Angeles County Child Care and Development Needs Assessment are:

- 1. The need for full-day child care and development services for low-income working families is still great, especially for infants and toddlers.**

There are 350,597 children, ages zero to 12, in low-income working families in Los Angeles County. Currently, the spaces and/or subsidized child care and development services available to them is sufficient to serve only 50 percent (across all ages) of those who are likely to need them. The lack of subsidized care is particularly acute for infants and toddlers (77,942) as spaces/services for this age group are sufficient to meet the need of only 21 percent.

2. There has been a dramatic drop in the availability of licensed family child care homes.

Between 2006 and 2011, 2,873 licensed family child care homes closed. This is a phenomenon related primarily to the recession. When the economy rebounds, these spaces will be badly needed.

3. There has been a substantial increase in the availability of part-day preschool spaces for three and four year olds in Los Angeles County, although many spaces are situated where there is diminishing need or where there is an oversupply of spaces.

A primary reason to form the ECE Data Collaboration was to obtain an accurate picture of the need for part-day preschool programs serving children just before kindergarten. A concerted effort has resulted in a consensus about the areas that have significant unmet need and these are very few in number. Only 40 zip codes out of 300+ have significant unmet need for part-day preschool for low-income children. There are currently enough part-day preschool program spaces among all the program types to serve 70 percent of the children of three and four year olds in low-income families where at least one parent is non-working.

- *Geographic Priorities*

Geographic priorities for the expansion of subsidized child care and development services were calculated at the zip code level. The Needs Assessment identified the number of eligible children not receiving subsidized child care and development services in each zip code. Formulas were applied to that data, ranking each zip code as a first, second, or third priority, or as not eligible for expansion funding. The formulas used were developed and approved by the Planning Committee and then approved by CDE. This analysis identified 90 zip codes for expansion of full-day child development services. Only 40 zip codes were assigned a priority for part-day preschool.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

Compiling, analyzing, and sharing the data produced in the Needs Assessment and the Priorities Report assists those currently serving young children in child care and development programs, those considering the development or expansion of programs, and those service providers working with families needing these services. It provides an accurate estimation of conditions that affect access and availability of various types of care which can be used in planning and implementation of projects to enhance the availability of care for specific populations or geographies.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
March 20, 2012
Page 5

It should also be considered a tool for advocating for public investment in child care and development services for under-served populations which include many County client families.

Upon approval by the Board, both the Needs Assessment report and the Priorities Report will be available on the web at www.childcare.lacounty.gov

CONCLUSION

Two signed copies (original signatures are required) of the Priorities Report (Attachment II) should be sent to:


Office of Child Care
Service Integration Branch, Chief Executive Office
222 South Hill Street, 5th Floor,
Los Angeles, California 90012

Copies will be forwarded to CDE, as required.

Respectfully submitted,



WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer




KARLA PLEITEZ HOWELL
Chair, Child Care Planning Committee

WTF:BC
TP:LB:KMS:km

Attachments (3)

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel



Prepared by the Los Angeles County Child Care Planning Committee with funding from the California Department of Education, Child Development Division (CDE/CDD).



CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT 2011



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

GLORIA MOLINA

First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS

Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY

Third District

DON KNABE

Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH

Fifth District

LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ARTURO DELGADO, Ed. D.

Superintendent of Schools

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA

Chief Executive Officer

TRISH PLOEHN

Assistant Chief Executive Officer

KATHLEEN MALASKE-SAMU

Director, Office of Child Care

LAURA ESCOBEDO

Child Care Planning Coordinator,

Los Angeles County Child Care Planning Committee

Office of Child Care

Within the Services Integration Branch of the Chief Executive Office

222 South Hill Street, 5th Floor

Los Angeles, California 90012

Office: (213) 947-4103

Fax: (213) 217-5106

sib_occ@ceo.lacounty.gov

www.childcare.lacounty.gov

Los Angeles County Child Care Planning Committee

The mission of the Los Angeles County Child Care Planning Committee (Planning Committee) is to engage parents, child care providers, allied organizations, community, and public agencies in collaborative planning efforts to improve the overall child care infrastructure of Los Angeles County, including the quality and continuity, affordability, and accessibility of child care and development services for all families.

The first local child care planning efforts were launched in 1991 as a result of AB 2141, which created Local Planning Councils in each county. The Board of Supervisors and the County Superintendent of Schools authorized the convening of the Los Angeles County Child Care and Development Block Grant Planning Council in response to the legislation. The Council's purpose was to establish priorities for the allocation of federal Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) funds. In 1997, AB 1542 heralded the advent of welfare reform in California. While creating and defining California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs), the legislation also strengthened and broadened the role of the Local Planning Councils.

Based on this legislation the Planning Committee is mandated to:

- Establish priorities for State-funded child care and development services.
- Conduct a Countywide needs assessment at least once every five years.
- Conduct periodic reviews of child care programs funded by the California Department of Education (CDE) and Department of Social Services (CDSS) related to meeting priorities.
- Collaborate with many groups to meet local needs.
- Develop a comprehensive Countywide plan for child care and development to meet the needs of the County.

The Office of Child Care, within the Service Integration Branch of the Chief Executive Office, supports the work of the Planning Committee. Within this branch of County government, the Planning Committee is positioned to work with County departments, as well as other community groups and Commissions, to improve the lives of children and families in Los Angeles County.

This report was developed by the Planning Committee through the Office of Child Care in 2010-11. The analysis and recommendations contained in the report are not intended to be representative of the official positions of the CDE, which funds these efforts through the Local Planning Council.



This page intentionally blank

Table of Contents

	Executive Summary	Page i
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Overview of Results• Findings and Recommendations	
I.	Introduction	Page 1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Formation of the ECE Data Collaboration• Survey of Subsidized Child Care and Development	
II.	2011 Assessment	Page 2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Changes in Child Populations• Changes in Child Care Capacities• Estimated Use of Care by Type• The Affordability Factor• Child Care and Development for Working Families• Capacity to Serve Working Families	
III.	Priorities	Page 8
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assessment of Need of Low-income Working Families• Assessment of the Need for Half-day Preschool	
IV.	Service Planning Area (SPA) Profiles	Page 12
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SPA 1: Antelope Valley• SPA 2: San Fernando and Santa Clarita Valleys• SPA 3: San Gabriel Valley• SPA 4: Metro (Central Los Angeles County)• SPA 5: West• SPA 6: South Central• SPA 7: East• SPA 8: South Bay/Harbor	
APPENDIX A:	Data Sources and Calculations	Page 39
APPENDIX B:	Methodology	Page 43
APPENDIX C:	Aggregated County Report for California Department of Education	Page 46

This page intentionally blank

Executive Summary

The *Los Angeles County Child Care and Development Needs Assessment 2011* was conducted in partnership with the Los Angeles County Early Care and Education Data Collaboration (ECE Data Collaboration) whose members are the Los Angeles County Child Care Planning Committee (Planning Committee) through the Office of Child Care, Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) Head Start/State Preschool, and Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP). Each of the ECE Data Collaboration members operates under specific guidelines and standards that include the periodic review of conditions related to the need for child care and development services. The ECE Data Collaboration jointly developed a survey involving nearly 200 organizations to collect data on the availability of subsidized child care and development services, a first for Los Angeles County.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. The cost of care continues to be a burden for most working families.** Low-income working families face serious challenges locating full-day care, particularly for infants and toddlers.

As of July 1, 2011, families earning less than 70 percent of SMI as of 2005 are eligible for subsidized assistance¹; however, availability of funding for subsidies has always been less than what is needed in Los Angeles County and is continuing to decrease with the reductions to State and federal budgets. Eligible families earning less than \$50,000 are spending 21 percent of their gross income for full-time infant care in centers and 15.4 percent for family child care (FCC).

Only 55% of the thousands of children of low-income working parents have access to subsidized child care and development services. (*Table 7*)

- The lack of subsidized care is particularly acute for infants and toddlers as spaces/services for this age group are sufficient to meet the need of only 21 percent. (*Table 8*).
- Only 50 percent of preschool-age children in low-income working families are able to access subsidized child care and development services (*Table 8*).
- For school-age children, the un-served population has decreased to 31 percent of almost 200,000 children in low-income working families (*Table 8*). As noted above, available ASES Program and 21st Century CLC after school spaces were counted in the capacity numbers. These spaces are not intended to be “child care” for working parents, although they are used for that purpose by many families. Therefore, the estimate of unmet need for school-age children is conservative.

Recommendations:

- Increase funding from multiple sources, public and private, state and local to cover the costs of operating child care and development programs serving low income families which support optimal development of children and provide the support parents need to prepare for and participate in the workforce.
- Direct public subsidies to expand services to address the needs of greatly under-served populations, particularly those families with infants and toddlers.

¹ SB 70 (Chapter 7), the Education Trailer Bill approved by the Governor on March 24, 2011, reduced the income eligibility cap for subsidized child care and development services from 75 percent to 70 percent of the SMI, adjusted for family size, effective July 1, 2011.

2. The supply of part-day preschool spaces for three- and four-year olds has increased dramatically. Unfortunately, many of these services are located in communities with changing needs.

The ECE Data Collaboration was convened in part to obtain an accurate picture of the need for part-day preschool programs serving children just before kindergarten. A concerted effort has resulted in a consensus about the areas that have significant unmet need and these are few in number. Only 40 zip codes out of over 300 have significant unmet need for part-day preschool for low income children. There are currently enough part-day preschool program spaces among all the program types to serve 70 percent of the children in low-income families with at least one non-working parent. There remains a need for an additional 31,000 spaces to serve eligible children who would benefit from a part-day preschool program. *(Table 9)*

Recommendations:

- Carefully consider further development of part-day preschool options given the many different programs available to three and four year olds in the County.
- Conduct an annual review of the array of program types and their availability by the ECE Data Collaborative to monitor changes in need.
- Share the assessment results with Head Start, CDE-funded, and LAUP contractors to ensure an accurate understanding of the County's current resources and how to use them most effectively.
- Encourage flexibility in funding so that contractors can adjust their programs to meet the changing needs of the communities they serve in terms of offering care to younger children or providing a full-day instead of only a part-day program or vice versa.

3. There has been a shift in the type of care available to and used by preschool-age children.

Although there has been an increase in enrollment of four year olds in part-day preschool programs, there appears to be a gradual decrease in the use of center-based care by preschool-age children generally. This may be recession driven, but will have long-term impacts if too many centers close. Restarting a center-based program is not easy and when the economy rebounds, there will be greater unmet needs than exist currently. (See Section II)

Recommendations:

- Encourage support at state and local levels for expansion of centers offering full-day, full-year options.
- Create a greater incentive for providers of part-day preschool to provide full-day services by adjusting the standard reimbursement rate for full-time care.
- Support Constructing Connections LA to facilitate the development of new child care and development sites and the efforts to reduce regulatory barriers to development of center facilities.

4. There has been a dramatic drop in the availability of licensed family child care homes.

This is a phenomenon related primarily to the recession. When the economy rebounds, these spaces will be badly needed. Providers that closed their homes in order to take jobs may not return to operating a licensed family child care home. It should be noted that efforts to recruit and license new family child care homes in the next year will be placing these new businesses in a vulnerable position since the economy may not rebound sufficiently to create the demand necessary to fill enough spaces to make a new business tenable. (See section II)

Recommendations:

- Promote efforts to retain current family child care providers and then gradually work to increase licensed capacity as the economy improves.
- Encourage family child care homes to care for more infants and toddlers since there are so few options for that age group.
- Encourage the use of FCC for school-age children by studying the feasibility of developing a system of transportation that could provide pick-ups at school sites and transport to the Family Child Care Homes for after school care.

5. License-exempt care continues to be used at a high rate.

The use of license-exempt care varies by age of children, the highest rate of use by school-age children at 73% (Section II). Due to the large number of jobs in industries such as retail and health care requiring odd-hour shifts and evening and weekend hours, there will always be a need for the flexibility of license-exempt care for some families.

However, major reasons for the high use of license-exempt care are a lack of licensed options, or an inability to pay market rates for licensed centers and family child care homes. Center-based infant and toddler care in Los Angeles County costs, on average, \$10,494 per year.² For a family of four at the State Median Income (SMI) of \$54,828 per year,³ infant care costs more than 19 percent of gross pay. The average cost for family child care - \$7,721 per year - while less than center-based care, is still 14 percent of gross pay for the same household. The portion of earnings that go toward the cost of child care increases greatly for families earning less than the SMI.

The National Data Overview from the National Child Care Information and Technical Assistance Center of the Administration for Children and Families reports research indicating that key factors in parental choice of care are safety and trusted relationships with providers along with convenience and cost, particularly for low-income families. Moreover, the research indicates that a parent's choice of setting is heavily influenced by the availability of financial assistance. **Families who have access to such assistance are more than twice as likely to choose licensed center-based care for their children.**⁴

² This is an annual calculation based on the average full-day care for infants as presented in the 2006 Regional Market Rate (RMR) report for Los Angeles County from the CDE. While CDE conducts RMR surveys every two years, they have not published results from these surveys subsequent to 2006.

³ U.S. Census Bureau 2011.

⁴ Administration for Children and Families; National Child Care Information and Technical Assistance Center: <http://nccic.acf.hhs.gov/poptopocs/nationaloverview.html>

Recommendations:

- Monitor the impact of changes in policy and practice related to access for families.
- Encourage license-exempt providers to become licensed where appropriate.

6. The availability of after school care for school age children has changed dramatically due to the proliferation of the ASES Programs and 21st Century CLCs.

There are approximately 115,000 spaces on school campuses for after school recreation and enrichment funded through the After School Education and Safety (ASES) Programs and 21st Century Learning Centers (CLC) to support school achievement during after school hours. It should be noted that most of these programs, while free, do not commonly operate during school holidays or vacation periods. This makes them less than a perfect solution for many working families who must make alternate arrangements.

Recommendations:


- Advocate for more flexibility in using the ASES Program and 21st Century CLC funds so that more of these programs could offer full-day holiday and summer vacation services.
- Ensure that there are other options for families who want a different type of care for their school-age children.

7. There are areas of the County where the cumulative unmet need for child care and development services is driven by the needs of multiple, specific populations, such as infants and toddlers, working families seeking full-day services, and low-income working families in need of subsidized care.

In conducting the needs assessment for 2011, a review of the geographic priorities was included. This means that various populations needing child care and development services were taken into consideration simultaneously with a comparison of the respective supply available to each population. This strategy acknowledges that not all child care and development supply is meant to serve all populations and needs. The results of this type of comparison helped identify specific areas where solutions to addressing child care and development gaps would be more complex. Section IV of the report describes results by Service Planning Area (SPA), and provides specific details related to these areas.

Recommendations:

- Encourage all stakeholders, including leadership from all the program types serving each of these impacted areas, to work collaboratively to address needs and maximize available child care and development resources.
- Work with non-child care partners in identifying potential space for the development of more care. Potential partners include cities, park and recreation departments, and church organizations.
- Encourage greater collaboration between the Los Angeles County Community Development Commission and the Office of Child Care in reviewing the need for child care related to low-income housing projects and other developments coordinated by the LACCDC.



I. Introduction

The *Los Angeles County Child Care and Development Needs Assessment 2011* is the result of efforts of the Los Angeles County Early Care and Education Data Collaboration (ECE Data Collaboration) whose members are the Planning Committee through the Office of Child Care, Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) Head Start/State Preschool, and Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP).

Each of the ECE Data Collaboration members operates under specific requirements that include the periodic review of conditions related to the need for child care and development services:

- **LACOE Head Start/State Preschool** is required to conduct a comprehensive community-wide needs assessment every three years with updates in subsequent years. The assessment considers where services have been offered compared to where the families with the greatest need reside.
- The **Planning Committee** is required by its state-funded Local Planning Council contract to conduct needs assessments no less than every five years. The assessment looks at overall availability of child care and development spaces against the potential need as defined by the numbers of children in various populations such as working families, low-income working families, and preschool-age children in low-income families with at least one non-working parent. From these assessments, the Planning Committee establishes geographic priorities for future funding and general guidelines as to where more child care and development services are needed.
- **LAUP** must track the number of four year olds served in any type of preschool program in order to mark progress in increasing the availability of preschool opportunities for Los Angeles County children.

FORMATION OF THE ECE DATA COLLABORATION

In previous years, each ECE Data Collaboration member had conducted its respective assessment and analysis independently. The results of these efforts have sometimes proved confusing. LACOE Head Start identifies its under-served areas, which may be different than LAUP's and different still from the areas prioritized by the Planning Committee for additional services.

In conducting the independent needs assessments, each member often relied on different sources of demographic data. The result was that each assessment started from a different point in terms of the numbers of children in the County. In addition, each member had incomplete information about what resources were currently available to meet the needs of the population they were targeting for services. For example, LAUP applied a percentage to all licensed spaces in order to reach an approximation of how many were actually allocated to four-year olds. LACOE Head Start relied on reports from its delegate agencies to identify all subsidized services for low-income families, but could not distinguish which subsidized spaces were intended to serve only low-income working families. The Planning Committee relied on California Department of Education (CDE) reports and incomplete data on Head Start or other subsidized spaces since there was no central repository of that data.

Moreover, it was becoming clear that in some areas of the County there was an abundance of sites and spaces offered by competing programs that made meeting enrollment targets difficult, while in other areas of the County there was a dearth of opportunities for eligible families. Based on these issues, partners of the ECE Data Collaboration came together in 2010 to explore the possibility of jointly conducting a single, comprehensive needs assessment. This proposed needs assessment would address both the overall picture of child care and development service availability in the County and the service needs of specific populations of concern to each partner.

The first task of the ECE Data Collaboration was to agree on a source of basic demographic data and to identify all the permutations in populations necessary to the comprehensive needs assessment. Since 2000, the Planning Committee had relied on the Los Angeles County Urban Research unit to supply the specific demographic data reports related to number of children by age cohorts, children in families by income levels, etc. LACOE Head Start had also turned to the Urban Research unit in 2007 to provide data sets. LAUP agreed to change its source and use the data sets that could be requested through the Urban Research unit.

The next task was determining which data sets were needed. The ECE Data Collaboration discovered that while there was data needed by all partners (i.e. child counts by geographical units), some data sets would differ. LACOE Head Start needed to identify the number of children in homes at or below the federal poverty level (FPL) and up to 130 percent of FPL whereas the Planning Committee needed to identify children in families at or below 75 percent of the State Median Income (SMI) and LAUP needed to identify the number of children in families at or below 200 percent of FPL. The partners developed a list of the data sets that would be needed to meet the mandates of each needs assessment.

SURVEY OF SUBSIDIZED CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT

In addition to data on the children and families of Los Angeles County, data on available services was required. While the Planning Committee staff had data on licensed centers and family child care homes in Los Angeles County from the California Department of Social Services/Community Care Licensing Division (CDSS/CCLD), there was no comprehensive list of all subsidized sites and capacities in order to assess the capacity of subsidized services for low-income families. LACOE Head Start had information for its delegate agencies, but not for other Head Start grantees. LAUP could identify its sites and the numbers of spaces it funded, but had incomplete knowledge of other subsidized services that may be provided by those same contractors. The Planning Committee was able to identify some state-funded sites, but could not identify all of the sites operated by contractors with dozens of individual locations and with multiple programs and varying numbers of subsidized spaces at each site.

While locating all subsidized child care and development spaces in order to be able to geo-code them for future mapping was important, of greater importance was the knowledge of exactly how many spaces were offered at each site and for what program type and age group. In addition, the partners needed to know whether services were offered part-day, as is typical for part-day preschool programs, or full-day, which would more easily accommodate working families. **To obtain this level of detail required a survey of more than 200 agencies providing one or more of a half dozen different programs.**

II. 2011 Assessment

CHANGES IN CHILD POPULATIONS

Adjustments in organizing the data for the 2011 needs assessment were made because the Planning Committee was part of the ECE Data Collaboration. For instance, in previous assessments, the infant and toddler age group was designated as birth to age two, conforming to the CDSS/CCLD's definition of infants. Due to the emphasis placed on the collection of site specific data for subsidized programs through the survey, it was agreed that infants and toddlers be defined as birth to three years old conforming to Head Start and CDE program definitions.

Using the adjusted age definition had the effect of increasing the infant and toddler population and decreasing the preschool population as compared to the *2006 Needs Assessment Report*, since one

age cohort (two to three year olds) had been shifted from preschool to infants and toddlers. This made comparing population changes from 2006 to 2011 challenging. It also had the effect of increasing the shortfalls in availability of infant and toddler care.

CHANGES IN CHILD CARE CAPACITIES

During the last five years, a number of new centers became licensed while many closed. According to calculations by the Los Angeles County Office of Child Care the net result is a loss of 24 licensed centers compared to 2006. The change has been dramatic for licensed family child care capacity. In 2006, there were 10,496 licensed family child care homes; in 2011 there were 7,623 licensed family child care homes, resulting in a decrease of 2,873 (-27.4 percent). Most of the family child care homes that closed were licensed as *small*, serving a maximum of six to eight children.

No study has been conducted to date to determine the reason for the drop in the number of licensed family child care homes. Reasonable speculation suggests that the recession has had its toll on these fragile businesses. Parents with less income change their child care arrangements from the more formal and more expensive to the less formal and less expensive. A likely result of losing one's job would be to discontinue child care altogether. In many cases, family work hours were reduced so both the need for and ability to pay for care was lessened, causing families to turn to friends or relatives for care. In addition, many friends and relatives may have lost their employment and would now be available to take on regular child care responsibilities. Fewer people working or working less hours resulting in reduced incomes and more unemployed relatives would all contribute to a softening in the demand for licensed family child care.

Changes in the amount of subsidies available through local contractors may also have played a part in reducing the supply of family child care, particularly in low-income areas where families are more dependent on subsidies to manage the cost of care.

Small family child care homes are particularly vulnerable since even one or two fewer children enrolled may make it untenable to continue. In addition, many family child care providers count on the income of their spouses to make it feasible for them to operate their home businesses. When a spouse becomes unemployed or has reduced hours, the licensed provider may feel pressure to try to enter the regular job market to help replace the lost income or health benefits.

During this same time period, center capacity for infants and toddlers increased by 444 spaces (5 percent) (*Table 5*). There have been increases in licensed preschool care as well, but almost exclusively in subsidized half-day programs through the efforts of LAUP, expansion in State Preschool funding during 2008-09 and American Recovery and Reinvestment (ARRA) funds for Head Start.

Licensed school-age capacity decreased by approximately 2,152 spaces in Los Angeles County when the approved 2009 State Budget eliminated funding for the Latchkey programs.⁵ Simultaneously, funding for the After School Education and Safety (ASES) Program expanded, creating campus-based before and after school options on new sites and increasing capacity at already funded school sites. It should be noted that while the ASES Programs and the federally funded 21st CLCs may serve families as after school child care, the programs are not yet funded to operate during school holidays or summer vacations. In addition, there are no income eligibility requirements for students to participate in the ASES Programs or 21st Century CLCs. In the 2011 needs assessment, all the estimated ASES Program and 21st Century CLC spaces have been used in determining both the unmet need for school-

⁵ SBX8 1, Chapter 1: Budget Act of 2009: Revisions Approved: July 28, 2009; Item 6110-196-0001, Schedule 1.5(i), 30.10.020.920 and Provision 16.

age children of working families (all income levels) and the need for working families eligible for child care subsidies. The increased availability of ASES Program and 21st Century CLC spaces has dramatically decreased the gap between the number of children needing care and the spaces available.

ESTIMATED USE OF CARE BY TYPE

While the estimated use of care by type is based on a survey of families in 2006-07 prior to the official start of the recession, signs of the impending upheaval were slowly becoming evident and help explain some of the shifts in use of care by type displayed in the 2007 Los Angeles County Health Survey results.⁶ The recession did not begin or end on a dime. There were indications of a downward trajectory before the first quarter of 2008, which economists tag as the first official period of recession. Yet, the pre-recession slowdown likely had great impact on wage earners. A rising trend in the number of foreclosures, upticks in the unemployment rate since 2006, and decreases in number of work hours all occurred before the officially designated period of recession.

Research related to the impacts of the recession state that consumer choices change when a family is confronted with major adjustments in income. "Parents substitute between formal center and licensed family care, paid informal care, unpaid family friend and neighbor care, and parental care. When the economy contracts and employment shrinks, the first part of the child care sector to disappear is formal center care. Parents without employment cannot afford to keep children in center care (which is typically the most expensive) and will either remove their children from care altogether or substitute to lower cost formal and informal family care options."⁷

Job loss and reduction in hours have an effect on the choices parents make about the type of child care and development they use. There appears to have been a decline in likely use of center-based care and licensed family child care by preschool-age children and a commensurate increase in license-exempt care. For preschool children, use of child care centers decreased by nearly four percent and use of family child care homes by six percent. Use of license-exempt (family, friends, and neighbors) increased by nearly ten percent. (*Table 1*)

TABLE 1. ESTIMATED USE OF CARE BY TYPE FOR INFANTS AND TODDLERS AND PRESCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN ⁸									
Types of Care	Center-Based Care			Family Child Care			License-Exempt		
	2003	2005	2007	2003	2005	2007	2003	2005	2007
Infants and Toddlers	24%	14.7%	22.2%	13%	20.8%	20.3%	63.1%	64.5%	57.5%
Preschool-age	66%	63.4%	59.6%	7%	13.2%	7%	27%	23.4%	33%

Surprisingly, it appears that use of center-based care for infants and toddlers was on the rise in 2007. This trend may not have continued into the recession. Possible explanations for this shift could be the increase in ARRA funded Early Head Start spaces and a decrease in the number of family child care homes. It is also possible that higher income families, not as impacted by the economy, have opted for group care in greater numbers rather than other license-exempt options such as nannies.

There have been no new studies to update the estimated use of care by type for school-age children. Thus, the percentages used for the 2011 needs assessment are by default the same as those used in 2006 as shown in Table 2.

⁶ Los Angeles County Health Survey conducted by the Department of Public Health: publichealth.lacounty.gov/ha/hasurveyintro.htm

⁷ Warner, M. *Recession, Stimulus and the Child Care Sector: Understanding Economic Dynamics, Calculating Impact*. Cornell Cooperative Extension, Department of Regional Planning, Cornell University, 2009.

⁸ The years displayed reference the year in which the source data was gathered.

TABLE 2. ESTIMATED USE OF CARE BY TYPE FOR SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN						
Types of Care	Center-Based Care		Family Child Care		License-Exempt	
	2004	2006/2011	2004	2006/2011	2004/2011	2006/2011
School-age	21.1%	19.8%	3.7 %	6.7%	75.2 %	73.5%

THE AFFORDABILITY FACTOR

Cost of care is yet another factor that families consider in selecting one type of care over another or in choosing specific providers. Table 3 indicates the monthly and weekly average cost for center-based and family child care by age group and schedule (full-day or part-day) based on the Regional Market Rate (RMR) Survey conducted by the CDE/CDD in 2006.

TABLE 3. COUNTY AVERAGES FOR COST OF CHILD CARE				
CENTERS				
Period	Schedule	Infant and Toddler Average	Preschool Average	School- age Average
Monthly	Full-day	\$860.57	\$602.18	\$481.78
Monthly	Part-day	\$620.93	\$405.14	\$288.55
Weekly	Full-day	\$209.87	\$150.22	\$127.20
Weekly	Part-day	\$156.98	\$105.09	\$73.74
FAMILY CHILD CARE				
Monthly	Full-day	\$607.67	\$564.64	\$494.50
Monthly	Part-day	\$463.75	\$418.14	\$365.04
Weekly	Full-day	\$148.49	\$139.56	\$121.81
Weekly	Part-day	\$119.27	\$101.90	\$89.39

Considering that the median household income in Los Angeles County is only \$54,828,⁹ the portion of a family's income needed to pay for care in 2011 was higher than it was in 2006, 25 and 18 percent respectively. Families at this income level or less with more than one child would need to allocate an even larger portion of their income toward their costs of child care.

Some studies indicate that children in low-income families are less likely to be in centers than children from families with higher incomes, and more likely to be in license-exempt care (e.g. family, friend or neighbor).¹⁰ While public subsidies even the playing field for low-income families in terms of making more choices available to them, thousands of eligible families are waiting for subsidized child care and development services and having to make choices without that support. As of July 2011, prior to the elimination of the Los Angeles Centralized Eligibility List (LACEL),¹¹ there were over 30,000 children waiting for subsidized child care and development services in Los Angeles County.

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FOR WORKING FAMILIES

The needs assessment for working families in Los Angeles County consists of a comparison between need for care, regardless of families' incomes, and available spaces. It is further refined by comparing the use of certain types of care by age of child with the availability of that type of care. For example, the number of preschool-age children whose parents are likely to choose center-based care compared with the number of available licensed center-based spaces.

⁹ Census Bureau, 2011.

¹⁰ Administration for Children and Families; National Child Care Information and Technical Assistance Center: <http://nccic.acf.hhs.gov/poptopocs/nationaloverview.html>.

¹¹ LACEL was a web-based data system used by state funded child care and development programs to identify eligible families for enrollment. The program was eliminated from the 2011-12 budget (SB 87, Chapter 33).

While a count of licensed care is accessible and reliable, estimating need or demand is much more difficult. Families use child care and development services for a variety of reasons: employment, training or education; incapacitation of a parent; and/or to enhance the development of their child. There are several populations in Los Angeles County for whom child care and development services are critical for the development of the children and a support for the family, even if parents are not working: teen parents attending school to complete their education; and families involved with the Department of Child and Family Services (DCFS) for whom child care may be recommended as part of a case plan.

Data on the numbers of working families is available and reliable; however, the number of parents who are participating in a job training program or attending school is less available. As yet there is little reliable data on the families who would use child care and development services only for the child's benefit, not as a substitution for parental care. In addition, we know anecdotally that many parents who work choose alternate work shifts in order for one parent to be with the children at all times, or parents work only during the hours in which their children attend school. These "working" parents are not technically in the market for child care services. Again, reliable data on the numbers of families in these situations is not available.

It has been determined that the numbers of working parents in both single and two parent families would be the best indicator of overall need since this is the largest and most reliable number of children who are likely to need and use some form of child care and development on a regular basis. Although it may be a slight overestimate of those needing care because they work, it would compensate for the uncountable number of families who use child care and development because they are attending school, participating in a job training program, or solely for the benefit of the child. Table 4 gives the aggregated results of the analysis of estimated demand with available care for working families with children of all ages combined and compares 2011 with the results of the 2006 needs assessment.

TABLE 4. OVERALL COUNTY RESULTS									
	Number of Children 0-12	Number of Children 0-12 With Working Parents	Estimated use of care by type			Licensed Capacity*		Surplus/ Shortfall in Licensed Capacity*	
			Center	FCC	License Exempt	FCC	Center	FCC	Center
2006	2,016,161	1,020,477	329,600	108,586	582,290	103,278	256,126	-5,308	-73,474
2011	1,879,065	936,424	304,121	112,789	519,512	86,585	315,641	-26,846	-297
# change	-137,096	-84,053	-25,479	+4,203	-62,778	-16,693	59,515*	+21,538	-73,177

* Includes license-exempt center-based school-age spaces.

Two primary factors contribute to the differences in capacity between 2006 and 2011: 1) a dramatic decrease in the number of licensed family child care homes; and 2) a proliferation of ASES Program and 21st Century CLC spaces for school-age children.

It should be noted that the number representing the shortfall in center spaces (-297) is based on considering capacity for all ages in the aggregate. The picture is quite different when looking at separate age groups.

CAPACITY TO SERVE WORKING FAMILIES: OVERVIEW BY AGES

Tables 5 and 6 provide the basic comparison of estimated use of child care, by care type, to capacity of each type of care. The numbers from 2006 are for comparison purposes, although it is not possible to make a complete comparison of all categories for the infant and toddler and preschool-age groups since the two to three year olds were shifted from the preschool-age group to the infant and toddler group for the 2011 needs assessment.

TABLE 5. NET SUPPLY OF CARE FOR INFANTS AND TODDLERS AND PRESCHOOLERS

Infants and Toddlers	Number of Children	Number With Working Parents	Estimated use of care by type			Licensed Capacity		Surplus or Shortfall	
			Center	FCC	License Exempt	FCC	Center	FCC	Center
2006 (0-2)	306,197	142,757	20,985	29,679	92,093	25,973	8,731	-3,706	-12,254
2011 (0-3)	437,883	211,299	31,061	43,950	136,288	19,903	9,175	-24,047	-21,886
# change						-6,070	+444	+20,341	+9,632
Preschool-age	Number of Children	Number With Working Parents	Estimated use of care by type			Licensed Capacity		Surplus or Shortfall	
			Center	FCC	License Exempt	FCC	Center	FCC	Center
2006 (2-5)	616,631	309,235	196,055	40,819	72,361	50,091	154,276	9,272	-41,779
2011 (3-5)	451,217	222,918	141,333	29,426	52,160	39,004	130,656	9,578	-10,677
# change						-11,087		+306	-31,102

TABLE 6. NET SUPPLY OF CARE FOR SCHOOL-AGE

School-age	Number of Children	Number With Working Parents	Estimate use of care by type			Licensed Capacity		License-Exempt Capacity (center-based only)	Surplus or shortfall	
			Center	FCC	License Exempt	FCC	Licensed Center		FCC	Center
2006	1,093,333	568,485	112,560	38,088	417,836	27,214	31,392	61,727	-10,875	-19,441
2011	989,965	517,758	102,516	34,690	380,552	20,713	26,841	128,359	-13,997	52,684
# change	-103,368	-50,727	-10,044	-3,398	-37,284	-6,501	-4,552	+66,632	+3,122	+33,243

Infants and Toddlers

As is demonstrated in the infant and toddler section of Table 5, there is a substantial unmet need for licensed care for working families in both family child care homes (-24,047 spaces) and in centers (-21,886 spaces). This is not seen in the aggregated chart presented at the beginning because the availability of school-age programs masks the shortfall.

After allowing for the shift of two to three year olds into this age category, there is still an effective decrease in this age group of approximately 12,000 children. While spaces in centers increased very modestly (+444), the overall decrease in licensed family child care homes has meant a loss of over 6,000 spaces formerly available for infants and toddlers in working families.

Preschool-Age

After accounting for the shift of two to three year olds into the infant and toddler age group, there is still a decrease of three percent (approximately 21,000) in the number of three through five year old children. Based on the LACHS survey data, a smaller percent of preschool-age children were likely using center-based care and family child care, while there was an increase in the use of license-exempt options.

A shift of two year olds into the infant and toddler group, a decrease in the actual population of three through five year olds, and the estimated change in likely choices of care type has resulted in a smaller shortfall of licensed center spaces for this age group. Countywide the shortfall in licensed centers is only 10,677 spaces. The total number of licensed spaces (130,656) is less than the number presented in the 2006 needs assessment primarily because the part-day spaces have been culled out of the total

used for measuring capacity for working families. Despite population changes and preferences, the surplus of family child care spaces has remained almost the same (9,578 spaces).

School-Age

The school-age population has decreased by over 100,000 children, accounting for most of the change seen in Table 6. As has been stated previously, the increase in after-school spaces through the ASES Programs and 21st Century CLCs has changed the capacity picture for school-age children of working parents, despite the loss of over 2,000 licensed, subsidized spaces due to budget reductions in 2009-10.¹² Based on the reports used to conduct the needs assessment, there may be thousands more spaces in these programs than are likely to be used by working families with school-age children. Since there is no eligibility criterion such as income to access these on-campus programs, it is very likely that many children with non-working parents are also using the spaces. At the same time, the data indicates a greater shortfall of licensed family child care spaces for school-age children (13,997 spaces). This is probably the result of the overall drop in the number of licensed family child care providers.

III. Priorities for Development of Subsidized Child Care and Development

A mandate of the Planning Committee is to report to the CDE on the areas within the County where subsidized child care and development services are most needed. The report required by CDE lists all zip codes within the County and designates each as a 1 (highest), 2, 3, or NA (not applicable).

ASSESSMENT OF NEED OF LOW-INCOME WORKING FAMILIES

The population considered in this part of the needs assessment are working families whose gross income is at or below 75 percent of the SMI as calculated by the CDE based on 2007 income data. The numbers of eligible families presented in this report will be slightly higher than might actually be eligible in that the State Budget approved for 2011-12 lowered the income eligibility level to 70 percent of SMI after data had been collected for the needs assessment.¹³

The capacity per age group (number served) is based on reports from CDE of those children actually enrolled in voucher-based subsidy programs such as the Alternative Payment Program and CalWORKs Stages 2 and 3 Child Care, and enrollment in a Family Child Care Home Education Network. It also includes counts from DPSS of those children enrolled in some form of child care through CalWORKs Stage 1. All these numbers are at a point in time. In addition, the numbers of spaces in subsidized centers collected through the ECE Data Collaboration survey were used. The numbers from the survey represent potential capacity, not actual enrollments. In other words, the survey presents the number of children that could be served. Altogether the data provides a picture of current capacity.

Priorities are determined by zip code as the most familiar small geographic unit. Each level of priority is determined based on the number of un-served eligible children in each zip code. The rules for determining priority levels were changed in 2011 after preliminary analysis revealed that the rules developed in 2008-09 were no longer adequate to capture the areas most in need. Based on the common analysis done with the ECE Data Collaboration and in consultation with a sub-group of the Planning Committee, new rules were developed. The rules were approved by the full Planning

¹² SBX8 1, Chapter 1: Budget Act of 2009: Revisions Approved: July 28, 2009; Item 6110-196-0001, Schedule 1.5(i), 30.10.020.920 and Provision 16.

¹³ SB 70 (Chapter 7), the Education Trailer Bill approved by the Governor on March 24, 2011.

Committee in December of 2011. The new rules for determining priority levels for subsidized care for infants and toddlers, preschool-age and school-age children of low-income working families are:

- Priority 1: At least 1,500 un-served eligible children, which represents no less than 25 percent of all eligible children.
- Priority 2: At least 750 un-served eligible children, which represents no less than 25 percent of all eligible children.
- Priority 3: At least 500 un-served eligible children, which represents no less than 25 percent of all eligible children.

Zip codes where the number of eligible children un-served falls below 500 have no priority for future funding of subsidized care. CDE has requested that priorities not be submitted for each age group, only by zip code for all ages combined. The results mask the greater needs for certain types of care. In particular, many areas have a great unmet need for subsidized infant and toddler care; however, because of the availability of preschool and/or school-age care, the resulting numbers of un-served children may be too small to have any priority.

Despite this limitation, there are over 90 zip codes with a priority rating in Los Angeles County. Details of the analysis and specific priority ratings are displayed for each Service Planning Area (SPA) in the SPA Profiles section of this report.

TABLE 7. OVERVIEW OF NEED FOR SUBSIDY FOR LOW-INCOME WORKING FAMILIES

SPA	Number in Working Families at/Below 75% SMI				Total	Eligibles Served			Total Served	% Served	Total Un-served	% Un- Served
	0 to 3	3 thru 5	6 thru 12	All Ages		0 to 3	3 thru 5	6 thru 12				
1	3,247	3,350	7,255	13,852	1,153	1,435	4,027	6,615	51%	7,237	52%	
2	13,587	13,674	35,806	63,067	2,599	6,843	24,437	33,879	54%	29,188	46%	
3	11,932	11,654	31,660	55,246	2,128	4,558	21,042	27,728	50%	27,518	50%	
4	9,677	10,748	25,303	45,728	1,878	5,412	22,488	29,778	65%	15,950	35%	
5	1,569	1,767	5,681	9,017	307	1,530	3,193	5,030	56%	3,987	44%	
6	14,840	14,381	33,071	62,292	4,151	9,312	26,201	39,664	64%	22,628	36%	
7	11,289	11,125	27,042	49,456	1,622	3,720	17,051	22,393	45%	27,063	55%	
8	11,801	9,077	31,061	51,939	2,610	5,390	18,132	26,132	50%	25,807	50%	
Total	77,942	75,776	196,879	350,597	16,448	38,200	136,571	191,219	55%	159,378	45%	

Table 7 shows that each Service Planning Area (SPA) is unique in its demand for and capacity to address the need for subsidized child care for low-income working families. SPAs 4 and 6 have the least unmet need. These SPAs have the overall lowest average incomes and historically have had many subsidized child care options. Yet, even in these communities, a third of all eligible children cannot access subsidized child care. SPA 7, the southeast area of Los Angeles County, has the greatest unmet need for subsidized services for low income working families; only four in every ten eligible children currently can be served.

Overview of Need for Subsidized Care by Age Cohorts

Breaking out the data by age presents a more precise picture of the differences in unmet need for subsidized child care and development assistance. Table 8 summarizes the unmet need for subsidized child care and development services available to low-income families by age of children.

TABLE 8. UNMET NEED FOR SUBSIDY BY AGE COHORT FOR LOW-INCOME WORKING FAMILIES					
Countywide Totals by Age Cohort					
Age Cohorts	Number Eligible	Number Served	Percent Served	Number Un-served	Percent Un-served
0-3	77,942	16,448	21%	61,494	79%
3-5	75,776	38,200	50%	37,576	50%
6-12	196,879	136,571	69%	60,308	31%
Total	350,587	191,219	55%	159,368	45%

Infants and Toddlers

As with the need/capacity dynamic for all working families, there is relatively little subsidized infant and toddler care. Countywide, only one in five eligible infants and toddlers are able to access subsidized services. SPAs 2 and 3 can provide services to accommodate only one in every six infants and toddlers; and SPA 7 can serve only one in every seven eligible infant and toddlers.

Preschool-age

There is more subsidized preschool-age care available for low-income working families in 2011. However, Countywide only about half of all eligible children can access a subsidy at this point. There are differences by SPA. In SPAs 5 and 6, 87 percent and 65 percent respectively of eligible children can be served. SPA 5, which encompasses the west side of Los Angeles County and the western beach cities, has the smallest population of eligible children since family incomes tend to be higher than the subsidized income threshold. While the amount of funding for subsidized care has remained fairly stable, the number of children eligible in SPA 5 has decreased resulting in a higher percent that are served. In SPA 6, there are very large numbers of eligible children since that area, south and south Central Los Angeles County, has a lower average family income. However, SPA 6 has traditionally had more subsidized programs and services. SPA 7, covering the east and southeast areas of Los Angeles County, has fewer subsidized services than the countywide average and current capacity meets the needs of only one in every three eligible preschool-age children.

School-age

Spaces available to the 196,879 children that would likely need subsidized care include ASES Program and 21st Century CLC spaces. As stated before, these spaces are not designated only for children of low-income working families and may be used by children with non-working parents. Therefore, while the percent of children served compared to those un-served appears promising, it is a conservative estimate and the need could be considerably greater. It is not possible to get a more accurate estimate without surveying each ASES Program and 21st Century CLC site to determine what percent of children served would be eligible for other state subsidized child care services.

Countywide, seven out of ten (70 percent) eligible children can be served. However, the picture is different based on the geographic region. For instance in SPAs 4 and 6 a greater percentage of children are served since the resources are more available (79 and 89 percent respectively). This is due in no small part to the proliferation of ASES Programs and 21st Century CLCs in these communities where there are higher rates of low income families and more schools with lower Academic Performance Index (API) scores, which is a criterion for receiving the ASES Program funding.

ASSESSMENT OF NEED FOR HALF-DAY PRESCHOOL FOR LOW INCOME FAMILIES


In determining the priority areas for half-day preschool, the number of three and four year old children in low-income families with at least one parent at home (non-working) was compared with all the

available subsidized half-day preschool spaces. The following types of programs were included in the count of half-day spaces: Head Start, State Preschool, LAUP, School Readiness Initiative, and LAUSD's School Readiness Language Development Program.

The new rules applied to the results of this analysis are as follows:

- Priority 1: At least 700 un-served eligible children, which represents no less than 25 percent of all eligible children.
- Priority 2: At least 500 un-served eligible children, which represents no less than 25 percent of all eligible children.
- Priority 3: At least 300 un-served eligible children, which represents no less than 25 percent of all eligible children.

Not surprisingly, there were fewer areas of high unmet need for half-day preschool than in 2006. Only 40 zip codes rated any priority and only six rated a Priority 1 designation. Details of the analysis and specific priority ratings are displayed for each SPA in the Service Planning Area Profiles section of this report.



IV. Service Planning Area (SPA) Profiles

Tables 9 through 11 summarize the status of each SPA. The pages following these tables contain a profile for each SPA including the availability of and need for child care and development services.

There are differences across the eight SPAs related to populations of need/demand and in the available capacity to serve the various populations. In Tables 9, 10, and 11, rates of unmet need for licensed care and for subsidized care are displayed along with the Countywide numbers. The numbers presented in the tables related to working families regardless of income include licensed care only, except in the school-age cohort where license-exempt center-based spaces are included. For a more nuanced look at need and availability for working families at all income levels, see Table 5 (Section II), which includes an estimate of use of license-exempt care and the shortfalls or surpluses for licensed care in family child care and centers.

TABLE 9. COMPARISON OF ZERO TO THREE YEAR OLD POPULATIONS WITH CURRENT CAPACITY BY SPA

SPA	Children in Working Families				Children in Low-income Working families			
	Total needing care	Licensed spaces available	Unmet need	% unmet need	Total needing care	Total Served	Unmet need	% of unmet need
County	211,299	29,077	182,222	86.3%	77,942	16,448	61,494	78.9%
1	7,754	1,751	6,003	77.5%	3,247	1,153	2,094	64.5%
2	43,991	5,734	38,257	87.0%	13,587	2,599	10,988	80.9%
3	39,457	4,961	34,496	87.5%	11,932	2,128	9,804	82.2%
4	20,621	2,390	18,231	88.4%	9,677	1,878	7,799	80.6%
5	10,351	1,443	8,908	86.1%	1,569	307	1,262	80.5%
6	24,726	4,166	20,560	83.2%	14,840	4,151	10,689	72.1%
7	31,448	3,085	28,363	90.2%	11,289	1,622	9,667	85.7%
8	32,951	5,547	27,404	83.2%	11,801	2,610	9,191	77.9%

TABLE 10. COMPARISON OF THREE TO FIVE YEAR OLD POPULATIONS WITH CURRENT CAPACITY BY SPA

SPA	Children in Working Families				Children in Low-income Working Families				3-4's in Low-income Non-working Families			
	Total needing care	Licensed spaces Available	Unmet need	% unmet need	Total eligible	Total Served	Unmet need	% unmet need	Total eligible	Spaces available	Unmet need	% unmet need
County	222,918	169,660	53,258	24%	75,776	38,200	37,576	49.6%	104,925	73,948	30,977	29.5%
1	8,257	5,972	2,285	27.7%	3,350	1,435	1,915	57.2%	3,497	2,177	1,320	37.8%
2	48,225	40,068	8,157	17.0%	13,674	6,843	6,831	50.0%	16,801	10,877	5,924	35.3%
3	41,395	29,327	12,068	29.2%	11,654	4,558	7,096	60.9%	14,652	13,013	1,639	11.2%
4	22,328	16,744	5,584	25.0%	10,748	5,412	5,336	49.7%	15,479	9,139	6,340	41.0%
5	9,737	13,101	(3,364)	-34.6%	1,767	1,530	237	13.5%	3,199	1,685	1,514	47.4%
6	23,705	18,579	5,126	21.7%	14,381	9,312	5,069	35.3%	21,452	14,011	7,441	34.7%
7	33,371	16,599	16,772	50.3%	11,125	3,720	7,405	66.6%	14,852	12,473	2,379	16.1%
8	35,900	29,270	6,630	18.5%	9,077	5,390	3,687	40.7%	14,993	10,573	4,420	29.5%

TABLE 11. COMPARISON OF SIX TO 12 YEAR OLD POPULATIONS WITH CURRENT CAPACITY

SPA	Children in Working Families					Children in Low-income Working Families				
	Total needing care	ASES/ 21 st Century & other spaces	Other spaces/ services	Unmet need	% unmet need	Total eligible	ASES/ 21st Century spaces	Other spaces/ services	Unmet need	% unmet need
County	517,757	128,359	47,552	341,846	66.1%	196,879	106,866	29,705	60,308	30.7%
1	20,025	1,721	2,192	16,112	80.5%	7,255	1,597	2,430	3,228	44.5%
2	112,715	26,219	11,260	75,236	67.0%	35,806	20,137	4,300	11,369	31.8%
3	97,798	21,336	9,283	67,179	69.0%	31,660	15,527	5,515	10,618	33.6%
4	47,873	21,209	2,972	23,692	49.5%	25,303	20,720	1,768	2,815	11.2%
5	24,662	2,951	3,447	18,264	74.1%	5,681	2,438	755	2,488	43.8%
6	53,875	21,069	5,077	27,729	51.5%	33,071	18,738	7,463	6,870	20.8%
7	76,407	17,892	6,078	52,437	68.6%	27,042	14,245	2,806	9,991	37.0%
8	84,402	15,962	7,243	61,197	72.5%	31,061	13,464	4,668	12,929	41.7%

* Only non-fee-based, license-exempt center spaces were counted in this column.

SPA 1: ANTELOPE VALLEY

1. General Population Data

There are 72,288 children from zero to 12 years old in the Antelope Valley, a slight increase of approximately 2,000 children from the population reported in 2006. Table 12 shows the breakout by age with information on the proportion of children of working parents, children in low-income working families, low-income children (preschool only) with at least one parent at home, and children under the supervision of child protective services (CPS).

TABLE 12. CHILD COUNTS FOR SPA 1

	Infants		Preschool		School-age	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Children*	18,157	25%	18,162	25%	35,969	50%
With Working Parents**	7,754	41%	8,257	45%	20,025	56%
In Low-income Working Families***	3,247	42%	3,350	41%	7,255	35%
Under CPS supervision**	899	4.7%	990	5.4%	1,717	4.7%
Low-income with one parent at home (Preschool only)****			3,497	19%		

* Percent represents portion of all children ages 0-12.

** Percent represents portion of all children within that age group.

*** Percent represents portion of children with working parents.

**** Percent represents portion of all three and four year old children.

Based on a calculation using the above data, it appears the percentage of SPA 1 families where all parents are working is 49.8 percent, which matches the countywide average (*calculation using Table 4 data*). SPA 1 is the area of residence for the highest percent of children of all ages involved in Los Angeles County's child welfare system. Children in the child welfare system would be eligible for subsidized child care and development services regardless of the parent's work status or income.

2. Availability of Care by Population and Age

Table 13 displays the capacity to meet the needs of the three populations described above: working families, low-income working families, and three and four year olds in low income families with at least

one parent at home. Children under the supervision of the child welfare system are among all of the above groups.

There are surplus spaces in family child care homes for preschoolers and school-age children and a shortfall for infants and toddlers. At least for preschool-age children, maximizing use of available family child care providers could address the shortfall in center spaces (-2,253) for working families if the services offered met parent expectations for a quality preschool experience.

Only one in four infants and toddlers can access a licensed space in SPA 1 compared with the county average of one in six. The unmet need for licensed care for preschool-age children is very similar to the County as a whole: 27.7% compared to 24% (*Table 10*). One in five school-age children have access to licensed or licensed-exempt center-based care compared to the county average of one in three. SPA 1 is doing relatively better for infants and toddlers, but the gaps for licensed infant/toddler care and care for preschool and school-age children are still large.

TABLE 13. CAPACITY FOR WORKING FAMILIES IN SPA 1							
	Infants		Preschool		School-age		
	CTR	FCC	CTR	FCC	CTR	Lic-ex	FCC
Licensed care (CTR, FCC); License-exempt CTR for school-age only	226	1,525	2,983	2,989	606	1,721	1,586
Shortfall/surplus for working families	-1,496	-49	-2,253	+1,899	-1,638		+244
Subsidized Capacity	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Subsidized spaces/services for low-income working families	1,153	35.5%	1,435	40.4%	4,027	55.5%	
Shortfall/surplus in subsidized care for working families	-2,094	64.5%	-2,115	59.6%	-3,228	44.5%	
Part-day preschool options for 3-4 year olds in low-income non-working families			2,177	62%			
Shortfall/surplus in part-day preschool spaces			-1,320	38%			

3. Subsidized Child Care and Development Availability and Priorities

Annually a report is submitted to the CDE detailing which geographic areas have the highest unmet need for publicly-funded child care and development subsidies. Tables 14 and 15 list the zip codes and provide details in terms of the extent of the unmet need. Based on the degree of need, a priority rating (1, 2 or 3) is assigned to each specific zip code.

TABLE 14. PRIORITIES FOR EXPANSION OF SUBSIDIZED FULL-DAY CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES IN SPA 1													
SPA 1	Number in Working Families at/below 75% SMI				Total	Total Eligible's Served			Total Served	% Served	Total Un-served	% Un-served	Priority
*Zip Codes	0 to 3	3 thru 5	6 thru 12	All Ages		0 to 3	3 thru 5	6 thru 12	All Ages				
93534	641	615	1,056	2,312		190	362	537	1,089	47%	1,223	53%	2
93535	812	688	1,695	3,195		301	335	1,141	1,777	56%	1,418	44%	2
93550	1,011	1,242	2,619	4,872		319	327	787	1,433	29%	3,439	71%	1
SPA Totals	3,247	3,350	7,255	13,852		1,153	1,435	4,027	6,615	48%	7,237	52%	#3

* Only those zip codes with substantial numbers of un-served children are displayed; all other zip codes have no priority.

Subsidized care includes both licensed and license-exempt situations that are paid for through state or local public funds for the benefit of low-income families and children. In SPA 1, a little over one-in-three infant and toddlers in low-income working families can access subsidized care. Currently, a little more than 40 percent of all low-income preschool children, and over 55 percent of eligible school-age children can access subsidized services (*Tables 9-11*). While the ratios are better than the Countywide

average (21%) for infant and toddler care (*Table 8*), the rates of availability for preschool and school-age children fall below County averages: 50 and 69% respectively (*Table 8*). There remain large gaps for all ages to ensure fair access to appropriate child care and development for low income families.

As displayed in table 14, three zip codes have a priority for future funds to expand full-time subsidized child care and development services; only one zip code, 93550 located in Palmdale, has the highest priority (1) based on the overall number of un-served children in each of the age cohorts.

TABLE 15. PRIORITIES FOR EXPANSION OF SUBSIDIZED PART-DAY PROGRAMS FOR THREE AND FOUR YEAR OLDS IN SPA 1

SPA 1 *ZIP CODES	Number In Families at/below 75% SMI with at Least 1 Parent at Home 3 & 4 YEAR- OLDS	Number of Spaces Available in Part-day Preschool Programs					Total Served 3-4	% Served 3-4	Total Un- served 3-4	% Un- served 3-4	Priority
		HS (3-4)	CDE CSPP	LAUP (4)	SRI (4)	OTHER					
93534	551		44				44	8%	507	92%	2
93535	922	120	240	78			438	48%	484	52%	3
SPA Total	3,497	1,008	879	290	0	0	2,177	62%	1,320	38%	#2

* Only those zip codes with substantial numbers of un-served children are displayed; all other zip codes have no priority.

While it appears that 62 percent of all eligible three and four year olds can access a part-day preschool program, the unmet need is somewhat higher than for the County as a whole – 38 percent compared to 30 percent. Only two zip codes had sufficient numbers of un-served children to qualify for a priority rating. These zip codes are in the Lancaster area where 75 percent of the unmet need is located.

4. Areas of Unmet Need for Multiple Populations within SPA 1

Child care and development services for all age groups are centered in the Palmdale and Lancaster areas, which are the major population centers of the SPA. One of the challenges in developing and utilizing child care and development services in Antelope Valley is the great distances between some residential areas and commercial/employment centers. In reviewing the three populations that are considered within the needs assessment (working families, low-income working families, and low-income three and four year olds with at least one non-working parent), zip codes 93534, 93535, and 93550 appear to have needs for more than one of these populations. Palmdale (93550) has a need for hundreds of additional spaces to serve infants and toddlers, preschool, and school-age children of working parents at all income levels. In addition, 93550 has the highest priority for funding to develop full-time subsidized care for low-income working families with children of all the age groups. Zip codes 93534 and 93535 (Lancaster) also have priorities for more subsidized care and have priority for expansion of subsidized part-day preschool programs.

SPA 2: SAN FERNANDO AND SANTA CLARITA VALLEYS

1. General Population Data

SPA 2 has the largest resident child population of any of the eight SPAs with approximately 380,422 children between the ages of zero and 12 years old. Table 16 presents the size of various sub-populations and the proportion of these sub-populations to one another, including children under the

supervision of child protective service (CPS). The rate of workforce participation by all parents of children across all ages is 53.9 percent which is higher than the County average of 49.8 percent.

TABLE 16. CHILD COUNTS FOR SPA 2						
	Infants		Preschool		School-age	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Children*	86,620	22.8%	92,058	24.2%	201,764	53%
With Working Parents**	43,991	50.8%	48,225	52.4%	112,715	55.9%
In Low income Working Families***	13,587	30.9%	13,674	28.4%	35,806	31.8%
Under CPS supervision**	1,216	1.4%	1,307	1.4%	2,130	1.1%
Low-income with one parent at home (PRESCHOOL ONLY)****			16,801	18.2%		

* Percent represents portion of all children age 0-12.

** Percent represents portion of all children within that age group.

*** Percent represents portion of children with working parents.

**** Percent represents portion of all three and four year old children.

2. Availability of Care by Population & Age

Table 17 looks at capacity in SPA 2 to meet the needs of the three sub-populations described above: all working families, low-income working families, and three and four year olds in low income families with at least one parent at home. Children under CPS supervision are included among all of the above groups.

TABLE 17. CAPACITY FOR WORKING FAMILIES IN SPA 2							
	Infants		Preschool		School-age		
	CTR	FCC	CTR	FCC	CTR	Lic-ex	FCC
Licensed care (CTR, FCC); License-exempt CTR for school-age only	2,119	3,615	32,812	7,085	7,504	26,219	3,756
Shortfall/surplus for working families	-7,647	-5,315	+2,240	+720	+11,405		-3,796
Subsidized Capacity	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Subsidized spaces/services for low-income working families	2,599	19.1%	6,843	50%	24,437	68.2%	
Shortfall/surplus in subsidized care for working families	-10,988	80.9%	-6,831	50%	-11369	31.8%	
Part-day preschool options for 3-4 year olds in low-income non-working families			10,877	64.8%			
Shortfall/surplus in part-day preschool spaces			5,924	35.2%			

There is a surplus in licensed preschool-age care for working families: 2,240 spaces in centers and 720 in family child care. There are some areas that still experience shortfalls in capacity while others may have many more spaces than are needed to serve the local community. The supply of preschool-age care for children of working families is greater in SPA 2 than in the County generally. There is a large shortfall of licensed infant and toddler spaces in both types of facilities.

There is an abundance of ASES Program and 21st Century CLC spaces, which gives the appearance of more school-age care than is needed. These spaces on school campuses were established to promote school performance without regard for the need for child care. The spaces are shared by children in working families, low-income children whose parents work and those whose parents do not work.

3. Subsidized Child Care and Development Availability and Priorities

Subsidized care includes licensed and license-exempt options, which are paid for with state or local public funds for the benefit of low-income families and children. Annually a report is submitted to CDE detailing which geographic areas have the highest unmet need for subsidized child care and

development services. Tables 18 and 19 lists the zip codes for SPA 2 and provides details in terms of the extent to the unmet need with the priority rating (1, 2 or 3) assigned to the specific zip code.

In SPA 2, less than one in five infants and toddlers in low-income working families can access subsidized care. Half of all low-income preschool and nearly three out of four school-age children can access subsidized services currently. Infant and toddler care is the least available and most needed. There are 15 zip code areas that have sufficient numbers of un-served children in low-income working families to warrant a priority designation. Of the zip codes, three have the highest priority: 91304, 91402 and 91405. Several of the zip codes have high numbers of infants and toddlers with very little subsidized care to address their needs. This is true for the priority 1 zip codes and also for 91335, 91343, 91406, 91601, 91605, and 91606. The following zip codes have particularly high unmet needs for subsidized school-age care: 91356, 91321, 91324, 91335, and 91402. Again, 91402 has a high unmet need for preschool-age children in low-income working families.

One zip code with no priority (91331, Pacoima) is an example of how the current parameters established by CDE for determining priorities can exclude areas where there is substantial need. While 91331 has a high need for more subsidized infant care (450+), the availability of subsidized care options for preschool and school-age children reduced the overall numbers of un-served children of all ages, which is how priority rankings are determined. There is a great deal of preschool and school-age care in the area. The result is that there is a shortage of only about 100 spaces for preschool-age children and no shortage for school-age care when all the ASES Program and 21st Century CLC spaces were accounted for. Thus the unmet need for infant toddler care is not made explicit.

TABLE 18. PRIORITIES FOR EXPANSION OF SUBSIDIZED FULL-TIME CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES IN SPA 2

SPA 2	Number in Working Families at/below 75% SMI				Total	Total Eligible's Served			Total Served	% Served	Total Un-served	% Un-served	Priority
*Zip Codes	0 to 3	3 thru 5	6 thru 12	All Ages		0 to 3	3 thru 5	6 thru 12	All Ages				
91205	328	247	1,009	1,584		51	94	679	824	52%	760	48%	2
91303	432	399	793	1,624		34	128	793	955	59%	669	41%	3
91304	373	644	1,007	2,024		65	194	238	497	25%	1,527	75%	1
91306	406	477	923	1,806		52	46	923	1,021	57%	785	43%	2
91321	202	245	703	1,150		15	21	214	250	22%	901	78%	2
91324	202	234	539	975		20	26	338	384	39%	591	61%	3
91335	593	544	1,690	2,827		113	342	905	1,360	48%	1,467	52%	2
91342	538	708	1,436	2,682		238	252	1,436	1,926	72%	756	28%	2
91343	947	800	2,249	3,996		128	389	2,249	2,766	69%	1,231	31%	2
91352	476	502	1,174	2,152		62	131	1,174	1,367	64%	786	37%	2
91356	145	129	509	783		20	37	35	92	12%	691	88%	3
91401	474	427	1,205	2,106		52	208	1,025	1,285	61%	822	39%	2
91402	1,125	996	2,897	5,018		186	280	1,230	1,696	34%	3,321	66%	1
91405	782	625	1,433	2,840		99	172	943	1,214	43%	1,626	57%	1
91406	648	571	1,642	2,861		84	176	1,345	1,605	56%	1,255	44%	2
91601	448	438	802	1,688		52	157	649	858	51%	830	49%	2
91605	659	644	1,383	2,686		107	297	1,383	1,787	67%	900	33%	2
91606	615	472	1,388	2,475		71	269	1,272	1,612	65%	863	35%	2
SPA Totals	13,587	13,674	35,806	63,067		2,599	6,843	24,437	33,879	54%	29,189	46%	#18

* Only those zip codes with substantial numbers of un-served children are displayed; all other zip codes have no priority.

TABLE 19. PRIORITIES FOR EXPANSION OF SUBSIDIZED PART-DAY PROGRAMS FOR THREE AND FOUR YEAR OLDS IN SPA 2											
SPA 2	Number of Children with at Least 1 Parent at Home	Number of Spaces Available in Part-day Preschool Programs					Total	% Served	Total Un- served	% Un- served	Priority
*Zip Codes	3 & 4 YEAR-OLDS	HS (3-4)	CDE CSPP	LAUP (4)	SRI (4)	Other	3-4	3-4	3-4	3-4	
91205	435	62	48				110	25%	325	75%	3
91342	859		51	36		395	482	56%	377	44%	3
91402	1,087	34	141	205		227	607	56%	480	44%	3
91405	810		122	96		124	342	42%	468	58%	3
SPA Total	16,801	2,510	3,971	880	103	3,413	10,877	65%	5,924	35%	#4

* Only those zip codes with substantial numbers of un-served children are displayed; all other zip codes have no priority.

Due to the relative abundance of part-day programs for three and four year old children in SPA 2, only four zip codes rated a priority (3), the lowest of the priorities. While the number of un-served children is close to 6,000, the children are scattered throughout the San Fernando and Santa Clarita Valleys. The four zip codes listed had sufficient numbers (16 percent of the unmet need) clustered within a limited geographic area to warrant a priority.

4. Areas of Unmet Need for Multiple Populations within SPA 2

The following zip codes in SPA 2 have unmet child care and development needs for multiple populations: 91304 and 91306 (Canoga Park/Winnetka) have a need for infant and toddler and preschool age care options for working families and for low-income working families and 91304 has a need for school-age care for both working and low-income working families.

A swath of the San Fernando Valley from North Hollywood (91601) in the south to Lake View Terrace and Sylmar (91342) in the north that includes the communities of Van Nuys (91405), Panorama City (91402), and Pacoima (91331) has a great unmet need for various populations. All of these zip codes have large shortages in infant and toddler care for working families and care options for infant and toddlers in low-income families. All of these zip codes have a center-based shortage for preschool-age children in working families, and all but 91331 also have a shortage of subsidized care for preschool-age children in working families. In addition, 91405, 91402, and 91342 have shortages in part-day preschool programs for three and four year olds with at least one non-working parent.

Given the average income levels of families in many of these communities, increasing subsidies or expanding directly subsidized programs for low-income working families would address the deficits in care options for many of the groups identified in SPA 2.

SPA 3: SAN GABRIEL VALLEY

1. General Population Data

SPA 3 has the second largest resident child population of any of the eight SPAs, with approximately 318,058 children between the ages of zero and 12 years old, representing a decrease of about 60,000 children (19 percent). Table 20 presents the size of various sub-populations and the proportion of the sub-populations to one another.

TABLE 20. CHILD COUNTS FOR SPA 3						
	Infants		Preschool		School-age	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Children*	73,997	23.2%	74,053	23.3%	170,008	53.5%
With Working Parents**	39,457	53.3%	41,395	55.9%	97,798	57.5%
In Low income Working Families***	11,932	30.2%	11,654	28.1%	31,660	32.4%
Under CPS supervision**	1,039	1.4%	1,292	1.7%	2,104	1.2%
Low-income with one parent at home (PRESCHOOL ONLY)****			14,652	19.8%		

* Percent represents portion of all children age 0-12

** Percent represents portion of all children within that age group.

*** Percent represents portion of children with working parents.

**** Percent represents portion of all 3 and 4 year old children.

SPA 3 has the highest percentage of families in the workforce (56.2 percent) across all ages. It is considerably higher than the County as a whole (49.8 percent) and the highest percentage of parents with infants and toddlers in the workforce (53.3 percent). It also has one of the lowest proportions of low-income working families.

1. Availability of Care by Population and Age

Table 21 looks at the capacity in SPA 3 to meet the needs of three of the populations described above: all working families, low-income working families, and three and four year olds in low income families with at least one parent at home. Children under the supervision of child protective services (CPS) are among all of the above groups.

As with most of the County, there is a lack of infant and toddler care options for working families at all income levels in SPA 3. Current shortfalls in licensed care options add up to over 11,000 needed spaces in centers or family child care homes for infants and toddlers. With unmet need for licensed care at 87%, only 1 in 7 or 8 will be able to access a licensed space. In contrast, SPA 3 has a much smaller deficit in preschool options since 71% of preschool-age children in working families might find a licensed space; and with a shortfall of only about 2,400 spaces based on preferences indicated through the LACHS survey. Due to the prevalence of ASES Programs and 21st Century CLCs on school sites, the deficit for school-age care is in family child care homes (-3,622) based on those who would choose licensed options for their school-age children. However, if we compare the total number of school-age children in working families against all licensed and license-exempt center-based care, we note a potential disparity of over 67,000 spaces (Table 11).

TABLE 21. CAPACITY FOR WORKING FAMILIES IN SPA 3							
	Infants		Preschool		School-age		
	CTR	FCC	CTR	FCC	CTR	Lic-ex	FCC
Licensed care (CTR, FCC); License-exempt CTR for school-age only	2,139	2,822	23,796	5,531	6,353	21,336	2,930
Shortfall/surplus for working families	-6,620	-5,188	-2,448	+67	+8,325		-3,622
Subsidized Capacity	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Subsidized spaces/services for low-income working families	2,128	17.9%	4,558	39.1%	21,042	66.5%	
Shortfall/surplus in subsidized care for working families	9,804	82.1%	7,096	60.9%	10,618	33.5%	
Part-day preschool options for 3-4 year olds in low-income non-working families			13,013	89%			
Shortfall/surplus in part-day preschool spaces			1,639	11%			

2. Subsidized Child Care and Development Availability and Priorities

Annually a report is submitted to the CDE detailing which geographic areas have the highest unmet need for publicly-funded child care and development subsidies. Tables 22 and 23 list the zip codes for SPA 3 and provide details of the extent to the unmet need with the priority rating (1, 2 or 3) assigned to the specific zip code. Subsidized care includes both licensed and license-exempt situations which are fully or partially paid for through state or local public funds for the benefit of low-income families and children.

In SPA 3, less than one in six (17.9%) infants and toddlers in low-income working families can access subsidized care. Four in ten eligible preschool-age children in working families can access subsidized child care and development; while two out of three school-age children can access subsidized services. Infant and toddler care is the least available and most needed. However, the percent of school-age children and infants and toddlers in low-income working families who cannot access subsidized care is higher than the Countywide averages. (Tables 9 and 11)

TABLE 22. PRIORITIES FOR EXPANSION OF SUBSIDIZED FULL-TIME CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES IN SPA 3												
SPA 3	Number in Working Families at/below 75% SMI			Total	Total Eligible's Served			Total Served	% Served	Total Un-served	% Un-served	Priority
*Zip Codes	0 to 3	3 thru 5	6 thru 12	All Ages	0 to 3	3 thru 5	6 thru 12	All Ages				
91016	255	285	957	1,497	28	72	465	565	38%	932	62%	2
91103	251	338	929	1,518	63	131	408	602	40%	916	60%	2
91104	246	268	804	1,318	102	134	484	720	55%	599	45%	3
91702	722	621	1,165	2,508	111	194	1,209	1,514	60%	993	40%	2
91706	1,159	959	1,723	3,841	94	241	1,563	1,898	49%	1,943	51%	1
91722	214	205	672	1,091	41	74	231	346	32%	744	68%	3
91723	106	177	580	863	36	74	74	184	21%	678	79%	3
91732	701	839	2,100	3,640	116	189	1,540	1,845	51%	1,795	49%	1
91733	586	633	1,485	2,704	86	130	974	1,190	44%	1,515	56%	1
91744	787	781	1,875	3,443	172	499	1,623	2,294	67%	1,149	33%	2
91745	164	230	725	1,119	39	46	317	402	36%	717	64%	3
91766	932	719	1,713	3,364	108	198	1,019	1,325	39%	2,040	61%	1
91767	750	516	1,080	2,346	118	205	980	1,303	56%	1,043	44%	2
91768	475	393	909	1,777	85	215	543	843	47%	934	53%	2
91770	469	561	1,292	2,322	56	194	1,008	1,258	54%	1,064	46%	2
91776	290	297	1,046	1,633	18	109	434	561	34%	1,072	66%	2
91780	135	132	427	694	21	15	124	160	23%	534	77%	3
91792	194	191	703	1,088	40	45	280	365	34%	723	66%	3
91801	192	317	1,051	1,560	28	38	635	701	45%	859	55%	2
91803	203	264	850	1,317	10	46	761	817	62%	500	38%	3
SPA Totals	11,932	11,654	31,660	55,246	2,128	4,558	21,042	27,728	50%	27,518	50%	#20

* Only those zip codes with substantial numbers of un-served children are displayed; all other zip codes have no priority.

TABLE 23. PRIORITIES FOR EXPANSION OF SUBSIDIZED PART-DAY PROGRAMS FOR THREE AND FOUR YEAR OLDS IN SPA 3

SPA 3 *Zip Codes	Number of Children with at Least 1 Parent at Home	Number of Spaces Available in Part-day Preschool Programs					Total	%	Total	%	Priority
	3 & 4 YEAR- OLDS	HS (3- 4)	CDE CSPP	LAUP (4)	SRI (4)	Other	3-4	Served 3-4	Un- served 3-4	Un- served 3-4	
91732	1,089	347	77	72	80		576	53%	513	47%	2
SPA Total	14,652	5,328	5,722	1,785	144	34	13,013	89%	1,639	11%	

* Only those zip codes with substantial numbers of un-served children are displayed; all other zip codes have no priority.

When it comes to part-day programs for low-income preschool age children, only 11 percent of eligible children (one in nine) cannot access a space. This is well above the county average of 29.5 percent of un-served.

Only zip code, 91732 has any substantial need for part-day preschool options for low income three and four year old children. This one zip code represents 31 percent of the unmet need for part-day preschool throughout the entire SPA. Other areas have some unmet need, but it is scattered with few children in any one area. Given that 89 percent of all eligible three and four year old children can already access a preschool space, it is not surprising that so few areas warrant a priority rating.

4. Areas of Unmet Need for Multiple Populations within SPA 3

Seven zip codes in the San Gabriel Valley have a substantial unmet need for multiple populations of children and families: 91702 (Azusa), 91706 (Baldwin Park), 91732 (El Monte), 91733 (South El Monte), 91744 (La Puente), 91792 (West Covina), and 91766 and 91767 (Pomona). All of these areas, except El Monte and Pomona, have a need of more child care and development options for infants and toddlers, preschool, and school-age children in working families and especially in low-income working families.

The zip codes in El Monte (91732) and Pomona (91766) have a great unmet need for infant and toddler and preschool options for both working families and low-income working families. In addition, zip codes 91732 and 91766 need more subsidized care for school-age children of low-income working families. And as stated above, 91732 is the only zip code in SPA 3 that needs more part-day preschool programs for low income families where at least one parent is at home.

SPA 4: METRO (CENTRAL LOS ANGELES COUNTY)

1. General Population Data

Geographically the smallest, SPA 4 has a resident child population of approximately 209,868 between the ages of zero and 12 years old. This is a decrease of approximately 20,000 children from the total in the 2006 Needs Assessment. This SPA has the next lowest workforce participation rate - 43.3 percent across all age groups. It also has one of the lowest rates of children under the supervision of Child Protective Services (CPS). Table 24 presents the size of various sub-populations and the proportion of the sub-populations to one another.

TABLE 24. CHILD COUNTS FOR SPA 4						
Child Counts: SPA 4	Infants		Preschool		School-age	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Children*	46,896	22.3%	50,095	23.8%	112,877	53.9%
With Working Parents**	20,621	44%	22,328	44.6%	47,873	42.4%
In Low income Working Families***	9,677	46.9%	10,748	48%	25,303	52.8%
Under CPS supervision**	513	1%	613	1.2%	1,014	0.8%
Low-income with one parent at home (PRESCHOOL ONLY)****			15,479	30.8%		

* Percent represents portion of all children age 0-12

** Percent represents portion of all children within that age group.

*** Percent represents portion of children with working parents.

**** Percent represents portion of all and 4 year old children.

2. Availability of Care by Population and Age

Table 25 looks at SPA 4 capacity to meet the needs of three populations: all working families, low-income working families, and three and four year olds in low-income families with at least one parent at home. Children under CPS supervision are among all of the above groups.

TABLE 25. CAPACITY FOR WORKING FAMILIES IN SPA 4							
	Infants		Preschool		School-age		
	CTR	FCC	CTR	FCC	CTR	Lic-ex	FCC
Licensed care (CTR, FCC); License-exempt CTR for school-age only	945	1,445	13,911	2,833	1,471	21,209	1,501
Shortfall/surplus for working families	-3,633	-2,741	-245	-115	+13,201		-1,706
Subsidized Capacity							
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Subsidized spaces/services for low-income working families	1,878	19.9%	5,412	50.4%	22,488	88.9%	
Shortfall/surplus in subsidized care for working families	7,799	80.1%	5,336	49.6%	2,815	11.1%	
Part-day preschool options for 3-4 year olds in low-income non-working families			9,139	59%			
Shortfall/surplus in part-day preschool spaces			6,340	41%			

There is only a small shortfall in preschool age care for children of working families (-360); and an oversupply of school-age care. This is due to the many school sites offering the ASES Program and 21st Century CLC. There is a small shortfall for school-age children whose parents would use family child care (-1,706). There is a large shortfall in licensed infant and toddler care options in both centers (-3,633) and family child care (-2,741).

When the needs of low-income working families are considered, there are bigger gaps between those who need the care and the subsidized spaces available. In SPA 4, only one in five low income infants and toddlers in working families will have access to subsidized services. Given the paucity of licensed care for this age group, it can be assumed that many of the infants and toddlers who are able to access a subsidy would be placed in license-exempt care.

The case for subsidized preschool care is somewhat better with 50.4 percent of children served, which means that about one out of every two children is able to access subsidized services. With the availability of ASES Programs and 21st Century CLCs on school sites, only 11 percent of school-age children of low-income working families may not be able to access a subsidized space. This is a conservative estimate since the ASES Program spaces are used by both working and non-working families without income criteria.

3. Priorities for Subsidized Child Care and Development

Annually a report is submitted to the CDE detailing the geographic areas with the highest unmet need for publicly-funded child care and development subsidies. Tables 26 and 27 list the zip code areas for SPA 4 and provide details in terms of the extent to the unmet need with the priority rating (1, 2 or 3) assigned to the specific zip code.

SPA 4	Number in Working Families at/below 75% SMI				Total	Total Eligible's Served			Total Served	% Served	Total Un-served	% Un-served	Priority
*Zip Codes	0 to 3	3 thru 5	6 thru 12	All Ages		0 to 3	3 thru 5	6 thru 12	All Ages				
90004	668	672	1,678	3,018		71	292	1,330	1,693	56%	1,325	44%	2
90005	464	559	1,118	2,141		132	255	1,121	1,508	70%	633	30%	3
90006	807	915	1,888	3,610		87	261	1,562	1,910	53%	1,700	47%	1
90017	400	460	781	1,641		31	46	727	804	49%	837	51%	2
90019	689	664	2,084	3,437		109	168	1,012	1,289	38%	2,148	62%	1
90020	340	444	922	1,706		29	45	46	120	7%	1,586	93%	1
90026	621	776	1,858	3,255		196	420	1,606	2,222	68%	1,033	32%	2
90027	184	186	836	1,206		38	123	271	432	36%	774	64%	2
90029	439	472	1,282	2,193		55	94	762	911	42%	1,282	58%	2
90031	481	504	1,168	2,153		62	242	1,168	1,472	68%	680	32%	3
90032	576	465	1,345	2,386		122	330	1,345	1,797	75%	589	25%	3
90038	342	355	804	1,501		72	190	729	991	66%	510	34%	3
90057	539	651	1,312	2,502		53	148	359	560	22%	1,941	78%	1
90065	528	515	1,144	2,187		33	102	1,144	1,279	58%	909	42%	2
SPA Totals	9,677	10,748	25,303	45,728		1,878	5,412	22,488	29,778	65%	15,950	35%	14

* Only those zip codes with substantial numbers of un-served children are displayed; all other zip codes have no priority.

In SPA 4, 14 of 30 zip codes warrant a priority for future funding to develop more subsidized care. Of these zip codes, four have a priority 1 status indicating a greater unmet need for all age groups.

Despite the overall average of only 35 percent unmet need across the ages of children, there are nearly 16,000 children that are eligible for and cannot access subsidized services. Of these, nearly 7,800 (49 percent) are infants and toddlers and 5,336 (33 percent) are preschool-age. One zip code that does not have a priority because of the aggregation of need for all ages is 90042. In this zip code alone, there are hundreds of infant and toddlers in low income working families who would not be able to access subsidized child care and development services. However, because of the prevalence of subsidized care for preschool-age and school-age children, the percent of unmet need is below the threshold for priority designation.

Expanding the availability of subsidized infant and toddler centers and Family Child Care Home Education Networks would have an impact on the general availability of infant and toddler care for working families. Increased subsidies for preschool-age children could expand the use of already available licensed care for preschool-age children in working families.

TABLE 27. PRIORITIES FOR EXPANSION OF SUBSIDIZED PART-DAY PROGRAMS FOR THREE AND FOUR YEAR OLDS IN SPA 4

SPA 4 *Zip Codes	Number of Children with at Least 1 Parent at Home	Number of Spaces Available in Part-day Preschool Programs					Total	%	Total	%	Priority
	3 & 4 YEAR- OLDS	HS (3- 4)	CDE CSPP	LAUP (4)	SRI (4)	Other	3-4	Served 3-4	Un- served 3-4	Un- served 3-4	
90004	1,107	60	8	24		226	318	29%	789	71%	1
90005	676	36				174	210	31%	466	69%	3
90006	1,186	499	128	96		99	822	69%	364	31%	3
90019	831	300	48		14	169	531	64%	300	36%	3
90020	706						0	0%	706	100%	1
90026	1,057	309	273			124	706	67%	351	33%	3
90033	1,008	237	168			239	644	64%	364	36%	3
90042	973	219	87			308	614	63%	359	37%	3
SPA Total	15,479	3,736	2,258	360	40	2,745	9,139	59%	6,340	41%	8

* Only those zip codes with substantial numbers of un-served children are displayed; all other zip codes have no priority.

There are fewer areas of substantial unmet need for part-day preschool for three and four year olds in SPA 4. Of the approximately 15,000 eligible children, more than 9,000 (59 percent) are able to be served. However, that leaves over 6,000 without a part-day preschool experience with a rate of unmet need at 41 percent, which is higher than the Countywide average of 30 percent. More than 3,600 of the un-served children are identified within the high priority zip codes displayed in Table 27. The remaining children are scattered in smaller numbers in the other zip codes.

4. Areas of Unmet Need for Multiple Populations within SPA 4

Within SPA 4 there are nine zip codes that have great unmet need for several of the populations included in this assessment: 90004, 90005, 90006 (Pico Union, Korea Town), 90019, 90020 (Wilshire Center), 90026 (Echo Park), 90029 (Hollywood), 90042 (Highland Park), and 90057 (Westlake).

Infant care for working parents and for low-income working parents is sorely lacking in 90004, 90005, 90006, 90019, 90020, and 90042. More than 1,700 licensed spaces are needed for children zero to three years old in these areas, representing 27 percent of all the unmet need for the entire SPA. The zip codes are also among the few in SPA 4 that lack availability for part-day preschool programs for low-income families and have been assigned a priority for future funding.

Zip code 90026 lacks infant and toddler and preschool spaces for working families and has a great need for subsidized spaces for all age groups of children in low-income working families. In addition, the zip code has a shortfall of part-day preschool spaces to accommodate eligible three and four year olds. Zip codes 90029 and 90057 have a great need for licensed spaces for all age groups to meet the needs of both working and low-income working families. As with much of the County, licensed infant care is in very short supply in SPA 4 and should be a priority for future development.

SPA 5: WEST

1. General Population Data

SPA 5 has a resident child population of approximately 86,844 between the ages of zero and 12 years old, a slight increase (1.1 percent) over the 2006 population number. Table 28 presents the size of various sub-populations and the proportion of the sub-populations to one another.

TABLE 28. CHILD COUNTS FOR SPA 5						
	Infants		Preschool		School-age	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Children*	20,609	23.7%	21,741	25%	44,494	51.3%
With Working Parents**	10,351	50.2%	9,741	44.8%	24,662	55.4%
In Low income Working Families***	1,569	15.1%	1,767	18.1%	5,681	23%
Under CPS supervision**	120	.005%	87	.004%	147	.003%
Low-income with one parent at home (PRESCHOOL ONLY)****			3,199	14.7%		

* Percent represents portion of all children age 0-12

** Percent represents portion of all children within that age group.

*** Percent represents portion of children with working parents.

**** Percent represents portion of all and 4 year old children.

2. Availability of Care by Population and Age

Table 29 looks at capacity to meet the needs of three populations: all working families, low-income working families, and three and four year olds in low-income families with at least one parent at home. Children under CPS supervision are among all of the above groups.

Child care and development options for preschool-age children in SPA 5 are plentiful compared with the other areas of Los Angeles County. There is a surplus in licensed preschool for all families and 85 percent of preschool children in low-income families are able to access subsidized care. However, only about half of all eligible preschool-age children have access to subsidized part-day preschool programs (Table 31).

TABLE 29. CAPACITY FOR WORKING FAMILIES IN SPA 5							
	Infants		Preschool		School-age		
	CTR	FCC	CTR	FCC	CTR	Lic-ex	FCC
Licensed care (CTR, FCC); License-exempt CTR for school-age only	611	832	11,642	1,630	2,579	2,951	868
Shortfall/surplus for working families	-1,687	-1,278	+5,466	+344	+647		-784
Subsidized Capacity	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Subsidized spaces/services for low-income working families	307	19.6%	1,530	85.7%	3,193	56.2%	
Shortfall/surplus in subsidized care for working families	-1,262	80.4%	-237	13.4%	-2,488	43.8%	
Part-day preschool options for 3-4 year olds in low-income non-working families			1,685	53%			
Shortfall/surplus in part-day preschool spaces			1,514	47%			

The surplus in licensed care for preschool-age children is not new to SPA 5. Usually this SPA displays higher numbers of licensed spaces for two reasons: 1) the average household income is higher in this SPA and parents can pay market rate for child care and development services, which is an incentive to create programs that will be self-sustaining; and 2) there are hundreds of working parents who travel to commercial centers within this SPA and use the care that is available so the programs serve both a resident and commuting population. This means that some families from other SPAs are able to

access care in SPA 5, which reduces the demand in adjacent areas. However, it is impossible at this time to estimate how many families (children) are served from other areas and which areas would then have a decreased demand.

While the numbers of un-served infants and toddlers are smaller in SPA 5, there is still a great need for more infant care (2,900+ spaces). Subsidized care for infant and toddlers is much less available than the preschool care discussed above. Only one in five low-income infant and toddlers can access subsidized care (*Table 29*).

School-age care availability for children in working families at all income levels is good; the net shortfall is only 137 spaces (*combination of FCC and center spaces from Table 29*). While Countywide only one in three school-age children can access a licensed or licensed-exempt school site space, only one in 237 children **will not** find a space in SPA 5.

3. Subsidized Child Care and Development Availability and Priorities

Annually, a report is submitted to the CDE detailing the geographic areas with the highest unmet need for publicly-funded child care and development subsidies. Tables 30 and 31 list the zip codes for SPA 5 and provide details in terms of the extent to the unmet need with the priority rating (1, 2 or 3) assigned to the specific zip code.

TABLE 30. PRIORITIES FOR EXPANSION OF SUBSIDIZED FULL-TIME CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES IN SPA 5

SPA 5	Number in Working Families at/below 75% SMI				Total	Total Eligible's Served			Total Served	% Served	Total Un-served	% Un-served	Priority
*Zip Codes	0 to 3	3 thru 5	6 thru 12	All Ages		0 to 3	3 thru 5	6 thru 12	All Ages				
90034	341	378	1,017	1,736		37	147	429	613	35%	1,123	65%	2
SPA Totals	1,569	1,767	5,681	9,017		307	1,530	3,193	5,030	56%	3,987	44%	#1

* Only those zip codes with substantial numbers of un-served children are displayed; all other zip codes have no priority.

As discussed in this section, there is less need for subsidized care in SPA 5. Only one zip code has sufficient numbers of un-served eligible children to warrant a priority ranking of 2. It should be noted that infants and toddlers make up 17 percent of the need for subsidized services, and 32 percent of the un-served population. In 90034 specifically, only about 20 percent are actually able to access subsidized services.

TABLE 31. PRIORITIES FOR EXPANSION OF SUBSIDIZED PART-DAY PROGRAMS FOR THREE AND FOUR YEAR OLDS IN SPA 5

SPA 5	Number of Children with at Least 1 Parent at Home		Number of Spaces Available in Part-day Preschool Programs					Total	%	Total	%	Priority
*Zip Codes	3 & 4 YEAR-OLDS	HS (3-4)	CDE CSPP	LAUP (4)	SRI (4)	Other	3-4	Served 3-4	Un-served 3-4	Un-served 3-4		
90034	548	31	70	32		114	247	45%	301	55%		3
90066	536		2			105	107	20%	429	80%		3
SPA Total	3,199	524	579	164	0	418	1,685	53%	1,514	47%		#2

* Only those zip codes with substantial numbers of un-served children are displayed; all other zip codes have no priority.

4. Areas of Unmet Need for Multiple Populations within SPA 5

The only area in SPA 5 that has consistent need for care for multiple populations is 90034 (Palms). The need is for subsidized care for all ages, for part-day preschool programs for low-income families; and this area has the highest unmet need for infant and toddler care for working families in SPA 5.

SPA 6: SOUTH CENTRAL

1. General Population Data

SPA 6 has a resident child population of approximately 254,182 children between zero and 12 years old, a decrease of 9,500 children from the 2006 population number. Table 32 presents the size of various sub-populations and the proportion of the sub-populations to one another.

	Infants		Preschool		School-age	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Children*	63,474	25%	63,417	25%	127,291	50%
With Working Parents**	24,726	39%	23,705	37.3%	53,875	42.3%
In low-income Working Families***	14,840	60%	14,381	60.6%	33,071	61.4%
Under CPS supervision**	1,495	2.3%	1,962	3.1%	3,172	2.5%
Low-income with one parent at home (PRESCHOOL ONLY)****			21,452	33.8%		

* Percent represents portion of all children age 0-12

** Percent represents portion of all children within that age group.

*** Percent represents portion of children with working parents.

**** Percent represents portion of all 3 and 4 year old children.

SPA 6 has both the lowest workforce participation rate and the highest percent of low-income families among the working families population. Only about 40.2 percent of SPA 6 parents are in the workforce compared to 50.1 percent Countywide. In addition, a higher percent of working families are low-income and eligible for subsidy – 60.9 percent compared to 37.6 percent countywide. Fully one in every three preschool-age children is in a low-income family with at least one non-working parent.

2. Availability of Care by Population and Age

Table 33 looks at capacity to meet the needs of three populations: all working families, low-income working families, and three and four year olds in low-income families with at least one parent at home. Children under CPS supervision are among all of the above groups.

SPA 6 Capacity for Working Families	Infants		Preschool		School-age		
	CTR	FCC	CTR	FCC	CTR	Lic-ex	FCC
Licensed care (CTR, FCC); License-exempt CTR for school-age only	738	3,428	11,859	6,720	1,512	21,069	3,565
Shortfall/surplus for working families	-4,751	-1,591	-3,170	-3,591	+11,914		-44
Subsidized Capacity	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Subsidized spaces/services for low-income working families	4,151	28%	9312	64.8%	26,201	79.2%	
Shortfall/surplus in subsidized care for working families	-10,689	72%	-5,069	35.2%	-6,878	20.8%	
Part-day preschool options for 3-4 year olds in low-income non-working families			14,011	65.3%			
Shortfall/surplus in part-day preschool spaces			-7,441	34.7%			

There is a good supply of after-school care, primarily due to the proliferation of ASES Programs and 21st Century CLCs on school campuses. However, this care is not available during school vacation periods so it may not completely serve the needs of working families. The need for more licensed care options for infants and toddlers and preschool-age children of working families is nearly equal. Given the high percent of families who are working and are also low-income, it is not surprising that the unmet need for subsidy for these age groups is also high:-10,689 and -5,069 respectively. (*Table 33*) Despite the high level of resources that have already been developed in this area, more spaces in both family child care and centers are needed, but there must also be more subsidies in order to ensure access to new spaces.

3. Subsidized Child Care and Development Availability and Priorities

Annually a report is submitted to the CDE detailing the geographic areas with the highest unmet need for publicly-funded child care and development services. Tables 34 and 35 list the zip codes for SPA 6 and provide details in terms of the extent of the unmet need with the priority rating (1, 2 or 3) assigned to the specific zip code.

SPA 6	Number in Working Families at/below 75% SMI				Total	Total Eligible's Served				Total Served	% Served	Total Un-served	% Un-served	Priority
*Zip Codes	0 to 3	3 thru 5	6 thru 12	All Ages		0 to 3	3 thru 5	6 thru 12	All Ages					
90001	1,112	969	2,169	4,250		209	411	1,326	1,946		46%	2,304	54%	1
90002	621	594	1,471	2,686		213	320	1,378	1,911		71%	775	29%	2
90003	804	896	1,772	3,472		341	701	1,579	2,621		75%	851	25%	3
90007	483	449	1,153	2,085		121	340	716	1,177		56%	908	44%	2
90011	1,879	1,355	4,077	7,311		260	879	3,453	4,592		63%	2,719	37%	1
90016	446	455	1,315	2,216		161	272	1,098	1,531		69%	686	31%	3
90018	650	668	1,477	2,795		216	538	1,186	1,940		69%	855	31%	2
90037	938	896	2,180	4,014		236	548	1,858	2,642		66%	1,372	34%	2
90044	1,419	1,787	3,926	7,132		468	729	3,184	4,381		61%	2,750	39%	1
90062	417	448	874	1,739		149	157	654	960		55%	779	45%	2
90220	586	546	1,203	2,335		176	290	1,203	1,669		71%	665	29%	3
90221	707	723	1,489	2,919		215	378	793	1,386		47%	1,533	53%	1
90222	439	401	912	1,752		113	139	675	927		53%	825	47%	2
90262	1,177	896	1,641	3,714		85	251	1,253	1,589		43%	2,126	57%	1
90723	872	935	1,807	3,614		82	153	1,176	1,411		39%	2,203	61%	1
SPA Totals	14,840	14,381	33,071	62,292		4,151	9,312	26,201	39,664		64%	22,628	36%	# 15

* Only those zip codes with substantial numbers of un-served children are displayed; all other zip codes have no priority.

While the percent of the low-income children in working families able to access subsidized child care and development services (64 percent) is high compared to other SPAs, the number of eligible children left un-served is huge: 22,628, of which over 10,000 are infants and toddlers(47 percent) (*Table 34*). Since several studies document that access to child care for low-income adults is a key factor in entering the workforce, the high rate of unemployment may be addressed to some extent by ensuring more subsidized infant and toddler care in this area.

TABLE 35. PRIORITIES FOR EXPANSION OF SUBSIDIZED PART-DAY PROGRAMS FOR THREE AND FOUR YEAR OLDS IN SPA 6

SPA 6	Number of Children with at Least 1 Parent at Home	Number of Spaces Available in Part-day Preschool Programs					Total	% Served	Total Un-served	% Un-served	Priority
		3 & 4 YEAR-OLDS	HS (3-4)	CDE CSPP	LAUP (4)	SRI (4)					
*Zip Codes						Other	3-4	3-4	3-4	3-4	
90001	1,433	102	331	48		335	816	57%	617	43%	2
90002	1,296	367	79	32	86	217	781	60%	515	40%	2
90003	1,847	433	148	24		358	963	52%	884	48%	1
90011	2,917	816	200	224		548	1,788	61%	1,129	39%	1
90018	784	73	114	23		141	351	45%	433	55%	3
90037	1,382	88	217	222		202	729	53%	653	47%	2
90044	1,886	444	382			416	1,242	66%	644	34%	2
90047	619	116	60	34		83	293	47%	326	53%	3
90062	521	29	100			44	173	33%	348	67%	3
90221	1,297	139	151	168			458	35%	839	65%	1
90723	879	161	164	96	60		481	55%	398	45%	3
SPA Total	21,452	5,762	2,967	1,921	382	2,979	14,011	65%	7,441	35%	#11

* Only those zip codes with substantial numbers of un-served children are displayed; all other zip codes have no priority.

In SPA 6, two out of every three eligible children are able to access a subsidized part-day preschool space. This is slightly less than the Countywide average of 70 percent served. There are over 7,000 children needing spaces distributed across 11 out of 20 zip codes, representing 24 percent of all the unmet need in Los Angeles County for part-day preschool.

4. Areas of Unmet Need for Multiple Populations within SPA 6

Several zip code areas within SPA 6 appear to have unmet need for multiple populations of children and families: 90002 (Watts), 90003, 90011, 90037, 90044 (South Central), 90221, 90222 (Compton), 90262 (Lynwood), and 90723 (Paramount).

Care for infants and toddlers in working families and subsidized care for children of all ages of low-income working families is greatly needed in all these areas. In addition, preschool options for working families of all income levels are needed in 90002, 90003, 90037, 90044, 90262, and 90723. Addressing the availability of subsidized care options, especially for infants and toddlers and preschool-age children, will positively impact the general availability of care.

Finally, as Table 35 indicates, all these areas have an unmet need for part-day preschool for low-income three and four year olds in families with at least one non-working parent.

SPA 7: EAST

1. General Population Data

SPA 7 has a resident child population of approximately 272,889 between the ages of zero and 12 years old, a decrease of about 27,000 (9 percent) from 2006. Table 36 shows the breakout by age with information on the proportion of children of working parents, children in low-income families, children

(preschool only) with at least one parent at home, and children under the supervision of child protective services (CPS).

TABLE 36. CHILD COUNTS FOR SPA 7						
	Infants		Preschool		School-age	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Children*	62,880	23%	64,181	23.5%	145,829	53.5%
With Working Parents**	31,448	50%	33,371	52%	76,407	52.4%
In Low income Working Families***	11,289	35.9%	11,125	33.3%	27,042	35.4%
Under CPS supervision**	120	.02%	1,142	1.7%	1,841	1.3%
Low-income with one parent at home (PRESCHOOL ONLY)****			14,852	23%		

* Percent represents portion of all children age 0-12

** Percent represents portion of all children within that age group.

*** Percent represents portion of children with working parents.

**** Percent represents portion of all 3 and 4 year old children.

2. Availability of Care by Population and Age

Table 37 looks at capacity to meet the needs of the three populations described above: all working families, low-income working families, and three and four year olds in low income families with at least one parent at home. Children under CPS supervision are among all of the above groups.

TABLE 37. CAPACITY FOR WORKING FAMILIES IN SPA 7							
SPA 7 Capacity for Working Families	Infants		Preschool		School-age		
	CTR	FCC	CTR	FCC	CTR	Lic-ex	FCC
Licensed care (CTR, FCC); License-exempt CTR for school-age only	480	2,605	11,500	5,099	3,349	17,892	2,729
Shortfall/surplus for working families	-6,501	-3,779	-9,658	+694	+64		-49
Subsidized Capacity	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Subsidized spaces/services for low-income working families	1,622	14.4%	3,720	33.4%	17,051	63%	
Shortfall/surplus in subsidized care for working families	-9,667	85.6%	-7,405	66.6%	9,991	37%	
Part-day preschool options for 3-4 year olds in low-income non-working families			12,473	84%			
Shortfall/surplus in part-day preschool spaces			-2,379	16%			

Like SPA 3, SPA 7 has many part-day preschool options, which is evident from the fact that 84 percent of eligible children may be served.

With a combination of licensed family child care, center-based care, and the licensed-exempt ASES Programs and 21st Century CLCs, it appears that all of the need for school-age care by working families has been met. However, this does not take into consideration that the ASES Programs and 21st Century CLCs are only after-school programs that operate when school is in session, not during vacation periods. It may not completely serve the needs of many working families, although it will be used by some of families as child care.

3. Subsidized Child Care and Development Availability and Priorities

Annually a report is submitted to the CDE detailing which geographic areas have the highest unmet need for publicly-funded child care and development services. Tables 38 and 39 list the zip codes for SPA 7 and provide details in terms of the extent of the unmet need for either low-income working families or for part-day preschool services with priority ratings (1, 2 or 3) assigned to specific zip codes.

TABLE 38. PRIORITIES FOR EXPANSION OF SUBSIDIZED FULL-TIME CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES IN SPA 7													
SPA 7	Number in Working Families at/below 75% SMI				Total	Total Eligible's Served			Total Served	% Served	Total Un-served	% Un-served	Priority
*Zip Codes	0 to 3	3 thru 5	6 thru 12	All Ages		0 to 3	3 thru 5	6 thru 12	All Ages				
90022	839	831	2,026	3,696		191	429	953	1,573	43%	2,123	57%	1
90063	725	715	1,625	3,065		104	311	855	1,270	41%	1,795	59%	1
90201	1,488	1,556	3,392	6,436		118	152	1,514	1,784	28%	4,652	72%	1
90241	483	507	1,322	2,312		30	115	162	307	13%	2,005	87%	1
90242	407	346	944	1,697		49	208	687	944	56%	753	44%	2
90255	869	753	2,147	3,769		93	369	1,153	1,615	43%	2,154	57%	1
90270	456	392	758	1,606		29	27	688	744	46%	862	54%	2
90280	1,033	822	1,738	3,593		97	153	1,738	1,988	55%	1,605	45%	1
90602	257	379	655	1,291		23	31	258	312	24%	979	76%	2
90605	362	368	731	1,461		35	65	569	669	46%	792	54%	2
90640	602	613	1,771	2,986		81	88	618	787	26%	2,199	74%	1
90650	878	752	2,224	3,854		149	584	1,596	2,329	60%	1,525	40%	1
90660	432	432	1,224	2,088		95	204	868	1,167	56%	921	44%	2
90706	839	839	1,620	3,298		114	198	795	1,107	34%	2,191	66%	1
90716	183	191	496	870		39	17	203	259	30%	611	70%	3
SPA Totals	11,289	11,125	27,042	49,456		1,622	3,720	17,051	22,393	45%	27,063	55%	#15

* Only those zip codes with substantial numbers of un-served children are displayed; all other zip codes have no priority.

SPA 7 has the highest percentage of unmet need for subsidized child care services across all age groups: 55 percent; the Countywide average is 45 percent.(Table 7) Unmet need for subsidized infant and toddler care is 85.6 percent, which is the highest for the entire County. As an indication of the great need for subsidized child care and development services for all ages, SPA 7 has more priority 1 areas than any other SPA.

TABLE 39. PRIORITIES FOR EXPANSION OF SUBSIDIZED PART-DAY PROGRAMS FOR THREE AND FOUR YEAR OLDS IN SPA 7												
SPA 7	Number of Children with at Least 1 Parent at Home		Number of Spaces Available in Part-day Preschool Programs					Total	%	Total	%	Priority
*Zip Codes	3 & 4 YEAR-OLDS	HS (3-4)	CDE CSPP	LAUP (4)	SRI (4)	Other**	3-4	Served 3-4	Un-served 3-4	Un-served 3-4		
90063	1,151	278	98			282	658	57%	493	43%		3
90201	2,051	478	596	64	115	275	1,528	75%	523	25%		2
90241	425						0	0%	425	100%		3
90280	1,719	240	255	198	96	490	1,279	74%	440	26%		3
90706	936	124	222	72			418	45%	518	55%		2
SPA Total	14,852	4,954	4,459	1,213	211	1,636	12,473	84%	2,380	16%		#5

* Only those zip codes with substantial numbers of un-served children are displayed; all other zip codes have no priority.

** LAUSD's School Readiness Language Development Program (SLRDP) provided on elementary school sites.

Because this SPA has an abundance of part-day preschool options, 84 percent of eligible children are served and there are only five zip codes with substantial numbers of children remaining un-served, however none are priority 1 areas.

4. Areas of Unmet Need for Multiple Populations within SPA 7

The following areas have the most substantial unmet needs in SPA 7 that relate to services for multiple populations: 90063 (City Terrace), 90201 (Bell Gardens, Bell, Cudahy), 90255 (Huntington Park), 90270 (Maywood), 90280 (South Gate), 90602, 90605 (Whittier), 90650 (Norwalk), 90706 (Bellflower), and 90241, 90242 (Downey).

City Terrace, Downey, Huntington Park, and Maywood need increased licensed care options for infants and toddlers, preschool and school-age children of working families and subsidized care for all age groups in low-income working families. In addition, 90241 (Downey) needs some part-day preschool spaces.

Bell, Bell Gardens, Cudahy (90201), South Gate, Norwalk, and Bellflower need more care for infants and toddlers and preschool-age children of working parents and subsidized care for all age groups in low-income working families. In addition, 90201 has unmet need for part-day preschool.

In Whittier (90602, 90605), there is need for care for infants and toddlers and preschool-age children of working parents and subsidized care for all age groups in low-income working families.

SPA 8: SOUTH BAY/HARBOR

1. General Population Data

SPA 8 has a resident child population of 283,896 between the ages of zero and 12 years old, a decrease of about 34,000 children (-10.7 percent) from the 2006 population. Table 40 displays breakouts by age, information on the counts and proportions of children of working parents, children in low-income families, or children (preschool only) with at least one parent at home, and children under the supervision of child protective services (CPS). The population proportions very closely match the Countywide averages, although the workforce participation rate is higher.

TABLE 40. CHILD COUNTS FOR SPA 8						
	Infants		Preschool		School-age	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Children*	64,651	22.8%	67,511	23.8%	151,734	53.4
With Working Parents**	32,951	51%	35,900	53.2%	84,402	55.6%
In Low income Working Families***	11,801	35.8%	9,077	25.3%	31,061	36.8%
In Child Protective Services (CPS)**	945	1.5%	1,098	1.6%	1,662	1.1%
Low-income with one parent at home (PRESCHOOL ONLY)****			14,993	22.2%		

* Percent represents portion of all children age 0-12

** Percent represents portion of all children within that age group.

*** Percent represents portion of children with working parents.

**** Percent represents portion of all 3 and 4 year old children.

2. Availability of Care by Population and Age

Table 41 looks at capacity to meet the needs of the three of the populations: all working families, low-income working families, and three and four year olds in low income families with at least one parent at home. Children under CPS supervision are among all of the above groups.

TABLE 41. CAPACITY FOR WORKING FAMILIES IN SPA 8							
	Infants		Preschool		School-age		
	CTR	FCC	CTR	FCC	CTR	Lic-ex	FCC
Licensed care (CTR, FCC); License-exempt CTR for school-age only	1,917	3,630	22,153	7,117	3,467	15,962	3,776
Shortfall/surplus for working families	-5398	-3,059	-607	+2,378	+2,717		-1,879
Subsidized Capacity	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Subsidized spaces/services for low-income working families	2,610	22.1%	5,390	59.4%	18,132	58.4%	
Shortfall/surplus in subsidized care for working families	-9,191	77.9%	-3,687	40.6%	-12,929	41.6%	
Part-day preschool options for 3-4 year olds in low-income non-working families			10,573	70.5%			
Shortfall/surplus in part-day preschool spaces			4,420	29.5%			

SPA 8 has a good supply of preschool child care and development options for working families; there is a very small shortfall of 607 center-based preschool spaces, which is made up for by a surplus of family child care spaces. There is an ample supply of school-age care as well, although many of the spaces are in the ASES and 21st Century CLC school site programs, which do not completely address the needs of working parents since the programs do not operate during school vacation periods. There is a shortfall in family child care spaces for school-age.

The greatest need is for licensed child care and development options for infants and toddlers. Only 22 percent of all children in this age group with working parents can access a licensed space. This mirrors the Countywide shortfall in subsidized care for infants and toddlers.

3. Priorities for Subsidized Child Care and Development

Annually a report is submitted to the CDE detailing the geographic areas with the highest unmet need for publicly-funded child care and development services. Tables 42 and 43 list the zip code areas for SPA 8 and provide details in terms of the extent of the unmet need for either low-income working families or for part-day preschool services with priority ratings (1, 2 or 3) assigned specific zip codes.

TABLE 42. PRIORITIES FOR EXPANSION OF SUBSIDIZED FULL-TIME CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES IN SPA 8

SPA 8	Number in Working Families at/below 75% SMI				Total	Total Eligible's Served			Total Served	% Served	Total Un-served	% Un-served	Priority
*Zip Codes	0 to 3	3 thru 5	6 thru 12	All Ages		0 to 3	3 thru 5	6 thru 12	All Ages				
90247	439	354	831	1,624		84	117	789	990	61%	634	39%	3
90250	1,072	952	2,974	4,998		297	350	1,370	2,017	40%	2,981	60%	1
90301	625	456	1,162	2,243		110	215	525	850	38%	1,393	62%	2
90302	507	371	1,084	1,962		139	171	406	716	36%	1,246	64%	2
90303	423	255	910	1,588		114	209	505	828	52%	760	48%	2
90304	412	312	1,194	1,918		31	48	1,065	1,144	60%	774	40%	2
90501	334	255	967	1,556		34	53	159	246	16%	1,310	84%	2
90504	136	76	524	736		11	8	83	102	14%	634	86%	3
90731	612	444	1,642	2,698		159	377	901	1,437	53%	1,261	47%	2
90744	673	581	1,962	3,216		100	591	1,368	2,059	64%	1,157	36%	2
90802	386	324	955	1,665		108	152	479	739	44%	926	56%	2
90804	400	333	1,276	2,009		90	94	531	715	36%	1,294	64%	2
90805	1,573	863	3,499	5,935		308	572	1,628	2,508	42%	3,427	58%	1
90806	520	460	1,470	2,450		101	319	710	1,130	46%	1,320	54%	2
90810	399	277	1,139	1,815		91	151	784	1,026	57%	789	43%	2
90813	1,060	936	2,538	4,534		136	245	699	1,080	24%	3,454	76%	1
SPA Totals	11,801	9,077	31,061	51,939		2,610	5,390	18,132	26,132	50%	25,807	50%	#16

* Only those zip codes with substantial numbers of un-served children are displayed; all other zip codes have no priority.

Several zip codes have substantial unmet need for subsidized services for children of low-income working parents across all age groups. Three zip codes rate a priority 1 ranking: 90250 (Hawthorne), 90805, and 90813 (Long Beach). In SPA 8, 50 percent of all eligible children are able to access subsidized care, which is a little lower than the Countywide average of 55 percent (*Table 7*). Once again, infants and toddlers have the least access to subsidized child care with only 22 percent served compared with 59 percent for preschool-age and 58 percent for school-age as discussed in *Table 41*. The zip codes ranked as first priority each have over 1,000 eligible infants and toddlers in need of subsidized care.

SPA 8 has a good supply of part-day preschool programs for three and four year olds, although there is still a regional shortfall of over 4,000 spaces. The zip codes most affected are displayed in the *Table 43* and represent 76 percent of the unmet need for half-day preschool spaces in the entire SPA, based on a calculation with data from *table 43*.

TABLE 43. PRIORITIES FOR EXPANSION OF SUBSIDIZED PART-DAY PROGRAMS FOR THREE AND FOUR YEAR OLDS IN SPA 8


SPA 8 *Zip Codes	Number of Children with at Least 1 Parent at Home	Number of Spaces Available in Part-day Preschool Programs					Total	%	Total	%	Priority
	3 & 4 YEAR- OLDS	HS (3-4)	CDE CSPP	LAUP (4)	SRI (4)	Other	3-4	Served 3-4	Un- served 3-4	Un- served 3-4	
90301	560		48				48	9%	512	91%	3
90501	514		128	16		36	180	35%	334	65%	3
90731	733	64	70			114	248	34%	485	66%	2
90744	1,034	128	100	47	43	169	487	47%	547	53%	2
90802	539	24	82				106	20%	433	80%	2
90804	662	128	46				174	26%	488	74%	3
90805	1,602	534	314	174			1,022	64%	580	36%	2
SPA Total	14,993	3,864	3,859	1,246	163	1,441	10,573	71%	4,420	29%	#7

* Only those zip codes with substantial numbers of un-served children are displayed; all other zip codes have no priority.

4. Areas of Unmet Need for Multiple Populations within SPA 8

Seven zip codes in SPA 8 have substantial unmet needs for multiple populations of children: 90250 (Hawthorne), 90301 (Inglewood), 90304 (Lennox), 90501 (Torrance), and 90804, 90805, 90813 (Long Beach). The first three zip codes are adjacent and form a strip between Florence Avenue on the north and Rosecrans on the south running just east of the 405 freeway. Each of the zip codes has a tremendous need for infants and toddlers in working families and in low-income working families. In addition, 90250, 90304, and 90501 and all the Long Beach zip codes lack preschool spaces to serve working families. All but 90304 have substantial shortfalls in subsidized care for school-age children.

Finally, 90301, 90501, 90804, and 90805 lack sufficient part-day preschool spaces for the eligible population.



This page intentionally blank

APPENDICES

This page intentionally blank

APPENDIX A. Data Sources and Calculations

POPULATION DATA: NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITHIN ZIP CODE, CENSUS TRACT, OR SERVICE PLANNING AREA (SPA)

The numbers of infants and toddlers, preschool children, and school-age children, as well as the number of children with two employed parents or a single employed parent was derived from U.S. Census Data and Department of Finance population data. The age categories are defined as follows: infants and toddlers (zero up to 36 months old); preschoolers (three through five years old); and school-age children (six to 12 years old).

For the analysis of need for part-day preschool, the number of three and four year olds in families where at least one parent is at home and where income did not exceed 75 percent of State Median Income (SMI) is used.

Analysis of the need for subsidized services relies on calculations using census data to count children/families by income categories, the largest being families at or below 75 percent of the SMI as of 2007. This income level was used because until July 2011, it was the ceiling for determining eligibility for CDE-funded child care and development services. While Head Start families must qualify at the lower Federal Poverty Levels (FPL), Head Start eligible children and families are captured in the counts of families using the 75 percent SMI standard.

ESTIMATED USE OF CARE BY TYPE AND BY AGE OF CHILD

Types of Care

Family Child Care (FCC) refers to settings where an individual has obtained a license to care for a small group of children (usually licensed for six to eight or 12 to 14 children) in his/her own home.

Center-Based Care refers to licensed facilities specifically designed to provide child care and development services to larger groups of children.

Legally License-Exempt Care is a category that includes in-home and out-of-home caregivers. Providers may be friends, neighbors, or family members. Nannies are included in the license-exempt care category. License-exempt providers are not required to obtain a child care facility license if they care for the children of only one family, excluding their own children.

There is another category of legally license-exempt care which is center-based. In this report we refer to this category as **school-age license-exempt center-based care**. As the name suggests, this is group care for school-age children situated on school campuses for the benefit of only those children attending the school. For the purpose of this needs assessment, we have included the number of license-exempt center-based spaces with licensed center-based capacity for school-age children. The numbers were obtained through a survey of school districts conducted in the winter of 2011 and the report of ASES Program and 21st Century CLC sites provided by LACOE, as well as the list of the L.A.'s Best sites operated on LAUSD campuses.

For Infants and Toddlers and Preschool Children

Rates for the type of care used by the two age cohorts, infant and toddlers and preschool-age children, are derived from the results of the most recently published Los Angeles County Health (LACH)

Survey.¹⁴ The LACH Survey consisted of interviews with 5,728 parents and was conducted via telephone in which respondents were selected using an unrestricted random digit dial sampling methodology inclusive of all eligible telephone households in Los Angeles County. Survey participants with children five years or younger were asked questions related to their use of child care. Survey results on the frequency of use of types of care reported by respondents were used to estimate the number of children, by age cohort, participating in each type of care Countywide. Using those estimates (for zero to three year olds, and three through five years old) as the universe, staff prorated the survey populations to determine a working percent that could be applied to the total population of children in working families for the needs assessment.

For example, LACH Survey response tables indicated that a certain percent of children zero to three years old were enrolled in licensed family child care. The percent was 20.3 percent of the total estimated population of zero to three year olds using any type of care. Thus, 20.3 percent was applied to the general population of zero to three year olds with working families as a way to estimate the likelihood of families using licensed family child care homes. The term “estimated use of care” will be used in all the tables for columns indicating the numbers of children in a particular care type based on the data described above. **The estimates are not to be viewed as actual counts, but only as an indication of the potential population likely to use a specific care type.**

This is important in considering the overall needs for child care and development in the County as it is clear that parents do have preferences and that just because a care option is available, does not mean it will be used. Quality, location, age of child, and cost are major factors in parental decisions about the type of care used. Adding up all the children and comparing that number with all the spaces in any type of care would over-simplify the picture of need and demand.

The estimates for the types of child care used by working parents for children from zero to five years were derived through calculations based on percentages extracted from the LACH Survey to create the formula.

Families with infant and toddlers:

- 20.3 percent are likely to use family child care
- 22.2 percent are likely to use center-based care
- 57.5 percent are likely to use license-exempt care

Families with preschool-age children:

- 7.4 percent are likely to use family child care
- 59.6 percent are likely to use center-based care
- 33.0 percent are likely to use license-exempt care

Specific estimates per SPA could not be generated due to small sample sizes for some of the SPAs, therefore the above percentages were applied Countywide.

For School-age Children

Estimates on use of care by type were derived from the Urban Institute's research which includes data from the National Survey of American Families (NSAF).¹⁵

¹⁴ Los Angeles County Health Survey conducted by the Department of Public Health:
<http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/ha/>

¹⁵ Capizzano, J., Tout, K., Adams, G. 2000; *Child Care Patterns of School-age Children with Employed Mothers*;
<http://www.urbaninstitute.org>

This survey provides data for child care arrangements of school-age children. The NSAF was a survey that relied on a random sample of telephone numbers, and in households without telephones, cellular telephones were provided to complete the interviews. The survey over-sampled low-income families as well as racial and ethnic minorities, immigrants, and recipients of government services. There has been no comparable survey related to school-age care since 1997. The article cited included data specific to California.

The estimates for the types of child care selected for school-age children by working mothers in California consisted of the following percentages:

- 19.8 percent for center-based care (including licensed and license-exempt programs)
- 6.7 percent for family child care
- 73.5 percent for license-exempt care

All remaining child care arrangements, such as nannies/babysitters, relatives, self-care, and parent/other care, were assigned to the license-exempt care category (73.5 percent).

These estimates of use of care by type for school-age children are not derived specifically from Los Angeles residents; the California profile from the Urban Institute report provided the best proxy for Los Angeles County estimates.

ESTIMATED LICENSED CAPACITY

The California Department of Social Services/Community Care Licensing Division (CDSS/CCLD) supplied data for the licensed capacity of family child care homes and centers.¹⁶ The data is coded so that licensed capacity by age for centers is easily obtained.

The data on capacity allows for differentiation between small and large family child care homes. Because family child care providers do not have to designate a particular age to be served as do licensed centers, it is necessary to estimate how many spaces overall might be used by infants and toddlers, preschoolers and school-age children. Age distribution within family child care homes was determined based on the results of the *California Early Care and Education Workforce Study: Licensed Family Child Care providers. Los Angeles County 2006*.¹⁷ The study included a telephone survey of 1,155 providers conducted by the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network and the Center for the Study of Child Care Employment. Providers were asked how many children were currently enrolled and the ages of the enrolled children. The responses provided an average enrollment by age that was used to calculate percentages applied to the total licensed capacity for each area. In Table 44, the average enrollment numbers have been rounded so that totals may not equal actual licensed capacity limits.

TABLE 44. ESTIMATED AVERAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN BY AGE IN FAMILY CHILD CARE				
	Small FCC (6)	Small FCC (8)	Large FCC (12)	Large FCC (14)
Infants	1.6	2.1	2.9	3.4
Preschool	2.7	3.6	6.3	7.4
School-age	1.7	2.4	2.8	3.2

¹⁶ March 2011.


¹⁷ Whitebrook, M., Sakai, L., Kipnes, F., Lee, Y., Bellm, D., Speigleman, R., Almaraz, M., Stubbs, L., & Tran, P. (2006). *California Early Care and Education Workforce Study: Licensed family child care providers. Los Angeles County 2006*. Berkeley, CA; Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, and San Francisco, CA: California Child Care Resource and Referral Network.

ESTIMATED SURPLUS/SHORTFALL

The estimated surplus or shortfall in capacity is the difference between the estimated need for/use of care by type and by age of children, and the respective capacities of each type of care. Complete data tables will be available on the Office of Child Care website at www.childcare.lacounty.gov. The spreadsheets and tables will indicate a surplus in capacity with a positive number and a shortfall with a negative number. It is not unusual to find that in the same geographic area there may be a shortfall for one type of care and a surplus for another type of care.

CAPACITY FOR LICENSE-EXEMPT CARE

The capacity for license-exempt care provided by individuals cannot be measured. In most circumstances, the individuals providing care are doing so based on a relationship with the parent(s) of the child. When the need for child care ends, so does the status of the individual as a provider of child care. It is possible to get a count of those receiving subsidies on behalf of income-eligible children at any point in time. However, this would exclude all other license-exempt caregivers who are paid directly by the families. This is a very fluid population that changes quickly and does not have the stability of licensed facilities or license-exempt school-based programs. For needs assessment purposes, it is assumed that the percent remaining after subtracting those children/families likely to use licensed care options, is the percent using license-exempt care.



APPENDIX B: METHODOLOGY

The survey of all center-based subsidized child care and development spaces was critical to conducting a comprehensive assessment of need for subsidized care throughout Los Angeles County. While each ECE Data Collaboration member had a piece of the data, there were still gaps in the information. In planning the survey, it was necessary for the ECE Data Collaboration to identify and accommodate overlaps among the contractors. Many Head Start agencies also provide state-funded preschool. Many LAUP providers are either Head Start or state-funded as well.

The survey was designed by the ECE Data Collaboration members to be conducted via e-mail as much as possible. The survey was initiated via an e-mail announcement followed by the actual survey forms. Each contractor was provided with an instruction sheet defining the fields in the survey and explaining how to allocate spaces by program type or schedule. The survey asked for agency name, site name, site address, zip code, and licensed capacity. Additional columns named a contract type (Head Start, Early Head Start, California State Preschool Program (CSPP), California Center-based (CCTR) for children from zero to three years old, Center-based for children from six to 12 year olds, LAUP, the School Readiness Initiative, and "Other (0-3)", "Other (3-5)", and "Other (6-12)". Next to each column naming a program type were columns where the program schedule (part-day, full-day) could be assigned to the space count for that program type. Those completing the survey were asked to indicate the number of spaces for each program type and then the number of spaces by schedule. For example, Agency A reports a total of 80 spaces in the CSPP column, and then further breaks them out in this way: 60 part-day/part-year and 20 full-day/full-year. This strategy would let the partners compare specific populations of children with the most appropriate service spaces.

Much time was spent in following-up with contractors who had not responded for one reason or another. In some cases, partners collected the data over the telephone and completed the spreadsheets for a contractor. For LAUSD, which has well over 100 sites and multiple programs, the data was requested through administrative offices using a different format that was "translated" into the survey spreadsheet.

There were some agencies that did not respond or responded with incomplete information, not using the survey. A spreadsheet was created on these agencies using CDSS/CCLD data, CDE contract data, and, where possible, the agency's website information. By triangulating these sources, the ECE Data Collaboration attempted to allocate the agencies' reported spaces to specific sites. This was done in very few cases where the numbers of spaces that would be uncounted were substantial; to leave them out would distort the end result too dramatically.

The results of the survey conducted between November 2010 and May 2011 is the most comprehensive and site specific information available for subsidized child care and development services in Los Angeles County. This became a key data source for the needs assessment analysis.

ADDITIONAL CAPACITY/SERVICE DATA

Other data sets used included CDE reports on child enrollments by age and zip code for non-center-based program types such as the Alternative Payment (AP) Program, CalWORKS Stages 2 and 3 Child Care, and Family Child Care Home Education Networks. The CDSS/CCLD data was used to define the universe of "licensed care" both in center facilities and in family child care homes. Other data was obtained from DPSS for enrollments of families in CalWORKs Stage 1 Child Care and from DCFS for the number of children with a child protective services designation by age and by zip code.

Finally, some program specific lists were obtained to round out the data collection. LACOE supplied a site specific list of the ASES Programs and the 21st Century CLCs; LAUSD provided a list of its Best

Start afterschool sites and its School Readiness Language Development Program (SRLDP) sites. The ASES Program, Best Start, 21st Century CLC and SRLDP sites are license-exempt. The school-age data provided in the above-mentioned lists was combined with the results of a survey of school districts conducted by the Office of Child Care asking about the license-exempt afterschool programs offered on school campuses. In the 2011 needs assessment, all the estimated ASES Program and 21st Century CLC spaces have been used in determining both the unmet need for school-age children of working families regardless of income and the need for working families eligible for child care subsidies. The increased availability of ASES Program and 21st Century CLC spaces has dramatically decreased the gap between the number of children needing care and the spaces available.

Armed with data sets of the number of children by one year age cohorts, the number of children in working families, the number of children in families at four different income levels and all the enrollment and site data, the ECE Data Collaboration was able to develop several spreadsheets, each of which presented a picture of need and capacity for various segments of child/family populations in Los Angeles County. The populations are:


- Children zero to three years old in working families;
- Children three to five years old in working families;
- Children six to 12 years old in working families;
- Children zero to three years old in low-income working families;
- Children three to five years old in low-income working families;
- Children six to 12 years old in low-income working families;
- Children three to four years old in families at or below 100 percent of the federal poverty level;
- Children three to four years old in families at or below 130 percent of the federal poverty level;
- Children three to four years old in families at or below 75 percent of the SMI and with at least one non-working parent; and
- Children three to four years old at all income levels.

Each population would be compared to the types of care for which that population of children was eligible. For example, numbers of children in working families would be compared to the available spaces in full-time child care and development services; low-income infants and toddlers would be compared to the availability of subsidized child care for ages zero to three. For the purposes of this report, the Planning Committee focused on children in working families (all ages), children in low-income working families (all ages) and children three to four years old in families at or below 75 percent of the SMI and with at least one non-working parent.

Once the spreadsheets were defined and produced, the ECE Data Collaboration worked on a process of joint analysis specifically for the data for low-income three and four year olds with at least one parent at home. This population was defined as the one best able to take advantage of the many part-day preschool programs available throughout the County. Part day preschool was the one form of child care and development for which all members of the ECE Data Collaboration needed to develop priorities. The joint analysis resulted in a rubric for identifying high need areas for funding and program development that was acceptable to all partners of the ECE Data Collaboration. The rubric involved identifying the zip code/census tract areas that appeared to have large numbers of un-served children. These areas were further screened based on the percent of un-served children and the availability of services in areas immediately adjacent.

The final rule used to determine priority ranking of 1, 2 or 3 for part-day preschool for three and four year olds in low-income families with at least one non-working parent is as follows:

- Priority 1: At least 700 un-served children, which represents no less than 25 percent of all eligible children.
- Priority 2: At least 500 un-served children which represents no less than 25 percent of all eligible children.
- Priority 3: At least 300 un-served children which represents no less than 25 percent of all eligible children.



APPENDIX C. Aggregated County Report for California Department of Education

County: Los Angeles	Number: 2419	Date Submitted: March 15, 2012
Contact: Laura Escobedo	Phone: 213 974-4102	E-mail: lescobedo@ceo.lacounty.gov

DEMOGRAPHICS						
Section 1: Number of Children in the County by Age Cohorts		Section 2: Percent of Child Population by Race/Ethnicity		Section 3: Child Population (grades K-12) by Threshold Languages		
<1	145,690	White	17.3 %		#	%
1	144,103	Hispanic	62.1 %	Spanish	689,824	43.82
2	148,091	Asian American/Pacific Islander	9.62%	Vietnamese	9,817	.62
3	151,979	African American	7.7 %	Cantonese	17,816	1.13
4	151,892	American Indian /Alaskan Native	.14%	Hmong	0	0
5	147,346	Multiracial	3.14%	Filipino	14,943	.95
6	140,078			Korean	19,710	1.25
7	141,754			Mandarin	16,631	1.06
8	141,917			Other: Armenian	17,569	1.12
9	145,720			Other: Farsi	4,825	.31
10	139,839			Other: Khmer	4,686	.30
11	138,697					
12	141,961					
Total	1,879,067					

SPECIAL NEEDS			
Section 4: Number of Children Who Have an Individualized Family Services Plan or an Individualized Education Plan by Age Group		Section 5: Number of Children Served in Child Protective Services Who Have Been Referred for Child Care and Development Services	
Age Group	IFSP	IEP	As of _____ (date)
0-2	10,171		# Data not available
3-5		19,741	# Data not available
6-12		85,374	# Data not available

INCOME						
Section 6: Number of Children in Families Receiving CalWORKs by Age			Section 7: Number of Children by Income Category, by Age			
TANF/CalWORKS	Total:	%:	Age Categories	At or Below Federal Poverty Level	At or below 70% of State Median Income	Above 70% SMI
	265,573	100%				
Infants	69,824	26.3%	Infants	99,493	233,251	204,632
Preschool	71,082	26.8%	Preschool	95,288	236,868	214,350
School-age	124,667	46.9%	School-age	209,617	500,900	488,975

Section 8: Number of Children in Migrant Families (50% or more of income is from Migrant work)

Children in Migrant Families

Not Applicable

DEMAND FOR CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Demand Source	Infant/toddlers (0-2)	Preschool (3-5)	School-age (6-12)
Section 9: Number of children in families with working parents who are at or below 70% SMI	78,067	76,039	196,879
Section 10: Number of children with all parents in the workforce who seek child care.	211,299 = 48.3%	222,918 = 49.4%	517,758 = 52.3%
Section 11: Number of 3-4's in families with at least 1 parent in the home (all income levels)		153,759	

CAPACITY**Section 13: Licensed Capacity for Age Groups and Children with Exceptional Needs**

Number of Spaces in Licensed and Licensed-Exempt Facilities	Infants (0-2)	Preschool (3-5)	School-age (6-12)	Spaces in Centers Specifically Serving Children with Exceptional/ Special Needs **
Centers	9,175	130,656	26,841	1057 (all ages)
Family Child Care Homes	19,903	39,004	20,713	
Licensed-Exempt Centers*	NA	NA	128,359	

* Includes legally licensed exempt center-based care for school-age children: COE list of ASES, other licensed-exempt programs; may include spaces in license-exempt Cal-Safe centers, spaces on military bases, and in Tribal programs.


**Centers serving children with special needs from CCL or R&R database.

COST OF CARE: County Level**Section 14: Weekly Cost of Care by Age and Type of Care**

Regional Market Rates	Center Full time Maximum	Center Full time Average	Center Part time Maximum	Center Part time Average	FCC Full time Maximum	FCC Full time Average	FCC Part time Maximum	FCC Part time Average
Infants/Toddlers	\$253.65	\$209.87	\$205.33	\$153.08	\$183.32	\$148.49	\$165.35	\$119.27
Preschool	\$182.03	\$150.22	\$153.08	\$105.09	\$169.99	\$139.56	\$144.69	\$101.90
School-age	\$155.25	\$127.20	\$100.90	\$73.74	\$151.30	\$121.81	\$126.19	\$89.39

ELIGIBLE CHILDREN SERVED			
Section 15: Children Served In Subsidized Child Care and Development Programs			
Program Type	Infant/Toddler	Preschool	School-age
Center-based	3,543		3,513
CSPP (full-time)		20,024	
CSPP (part-time)		24,694	
FCCHEN	709	367	252
Migrant			
Handicap Program			
Alternative Payment	2,041	1,816	3,206
Stage 1	4,081	3,069	4,256
Stage 2	3,847	3,511	7,012
Stage 3	2,011	2,639	11,467
Head Start		31,894 (4208+27686)	
Early Head Start	283		
Other: LAUP, SRI, SRLDP		21,568 (7859+1043+12,666)	
Other: ASES/21 st Century			114,978
Total	16,515	109,582	144,684

UNMET NEED						
Section 16: Countywide Unmet Need by Type of Care and By Age						
Type of care needed	Un-served Infant/Toddlers		Un-served Preschool		Un-served School-age	
Full time licensed (or licensed – exempt school-based for school-age children) because of work, etc.	182,221	86%	53,258	24%	341,845	66%
Full time subsidized care because of work, etc.	61,552	79%	44,613	58.7%	52,195	26.5%
Part time preschool care (all income) for enrichment and school readiness			77,107	50.1%		
Part time subsidized preschool care for school readiness/enrichment.			30,975	30%		



**Los Angeles County Part-Day CSPP Priorities
FY 2011-2012**

All zip codes for the county are listed and given a corresponding LPC priority ranking of 1, 2, or 3. All remaining (listed) zip codes are given NO PRIORITY and WILL NOT BE FUNDED. Please indicate those **No priority** zip codes with "NA".

County Number	ZIP CODE	LPC
SPA 1		
19	92397	NA
19	93243	NA
19	93510	NA
19	93523	NA
19	93532	NA
19	93534	2
19	93535	3
19	93536	NA
19	93543	NA
19	93544	NA
19	93550	NA
19	93551	NA
19	93552	NA
19	93553	NA
19	93563	NA
19	93591	NA
SPA 2		
19	90290	NA
19	91011	NA
19	91020	NA
19	91040	NA
19	91042	NA
19	91046	NA
19	91201	NA
19	91202	NA
19	91203	NA
19	91204	NA
19	91205	3
19	91206	NA
19	91207	NA
19	91208	NA
19	91214	NA
19	91210	NA
19	91301	NA
19	91302	NA
19	91303	NA
19	91304	NA
19	91306	NA
19	91307	NA
19	91311	NA
19	91316	NA

19	91321	NA
19	91324	NA
19	91325	NA
19	91326	NA
19	91330	NA
19	91331	NA
19	91335	NA
19	91340	NA
19	91342	3
19	91343	NA
19	91344	NA
19	91345	NA
19	91350	NA
19	91351	NA
19	91352	2
19	91354	NA
19	91355	NA
19	91356	NA
19	91361	NA
19	91362	NA
19	91364	NA
19	91367	NA
19	91381	NA
19	91382	NA
19	91384	NA
19	91387	NA
19	91390	NA
19	91401	NA
19	91402	3
19	91403	NA
19	91405	3
19	91406	NA
19	91411	NA
19	91423	NA
19	91436	NA
19	91501	NA
19	91502	NA
19	91504	NA
19	91505	NA
19	91506	NA
19	91521	NA
19	91522	NA
19	91523	NA
19	91601	2
19	91602	NA
19	91604	NA
19	91605	NA
19	91606	NA
19	91607	NA
19	91608	NA

ATTACHMENT II

19	91001	NA
19	91006	NA
19	91007	NA
19	91010	NA
19	91011	NA
19	91016	NA
19	91023	NA
19	91024	NA
19	91030	NA
19	91042	NA
19	91101	NA
19	91103	NA
19	91104	NA
19	91105	NA
19	91106	NA
19	91107	NA
19	91108	NA
19	91125	NA
19	91126	NA
19	91214	NA
19	91702	NA
19	91706	NA
19	91709	NA
19	91710	NA
19	91711	NA
19	91722	NA
19	91723	NA
19	91724	NA
19	91731	NA
19	91732	3
19	91733	NA
19	91740	NA
19	91741	NA
19	91744	NA
19	91745	NA
19	91746	NA
19	91748	NA
19	91750	NA
19	91754	NA
19	91755	NA
19	91759	NA
19	91763	NA
19	91765	NA
19	91766	NA
19	91767	NA
19	91768	NA
19	91770	NA
19	91773	NA
19	91775	NA
19	91776	NA
19	91780	NA
19	91786	NA

19	91789	NA
19	91790	NA
19	91791	NA
19	91792	NA
19	91801	NA
19	91803	NA

SPA 4

19	90004	1
19	90005	3
19	90006	3
19	90010	NA
19	90012	NA
19	90013	NA
19	90014	NA
19	90015	NA
19	90017	NA
19	90019	3
19	90020	1
19	90021	NA
19	90023	NA
19	90026	3
19	90027	NA
19	90028	NA
19	90029	NA
19	90031	NA
19	90032	NA
19	90033	3
19	90036	NA
19	90038	3
19	90039	NA
19	90041	NA
19	90042	3
19	90046	NA
19	90048	NA
19	90057	NA
19	90065	NA
19	90068	NA
19	90069	NA

SPA 5

19	90024	NA
19	90025	NA
19	90034	3
19	90035	NA
19	90045	NA
19	90049	NA
19	90056	NA
19	90064	NA
19	90066	3
19	90067	NA
19	90077	NA
19	90094	NA

19	90095	NA
19	90210	NA
19	90211	NA
19	90212	NA
19	90230	NA
19	90232	NA
19	90265	NA
19	90272	NA
19	90291	NA
19	90292	NA
19	90293	NA
19	90401	NA
19	90402	NA
19	90403	NA
19	90404	NA
19	90405	NA

SPA 6

19	90001	2
19	90002	2
19	90003	1
19	90007	NA
19	90008	NA
19	90011	1
19	90016	NA
19	90018	3
19	90037	2
19	90043	NA
19	90044	2
19	90047	3
19	90058	NA
19	90059	NA
19	90061	NA
19	90062	3
19	90089	NA
19	90220	NA
19	90221	1
19	90222	NA
19	90262	NA
19	90723	3

SPA 7

19	90022	NA
19	90040	NA
19	90063	3
19	90201	2
19	90240	NA
19	90241	3
19	90242	NA
19	90255	NA
19	90270	NA
19	90280	3
19	90601	NA

19	90602	NA
19	90603	NA
19	90604	NA
19	90605	NA
19	90606	NA
19	90623	NA
19	90630	NA
19	90631	NA
19	90638	NA
19	90639	NA
19	90640	NA
19	90650	NA
19	90660	NA
19	90670	NA
19	90701	NA
19	90703	NA
19	90706	2
19	90712	NA
19	90713	NA
19	90715	NA
19	90716	NA

SPA 8

19	90245	NA
19	90247	NA
19	90248	NA
19	90249	NA
19	90250	NA
19	90254	NA
19	90260	NA
19	90266	NA
19	90274	NA
19	90275	NA
19	90277	NA
19	90278	NA
19	90301	3
19	90302	NA
19	90303	NA
19	90304	NA
19	90305	NA
19	90501	3
19	90502	NA
19	90503	NA
19	90504	NA
19	90505	NA
19	90506	NA
19	90704	NA
19	90710	NA
19	90717	NA
19	90731	2
19	90732	NA

19	90744	2
19	90745	NA
19	90746	NA
19	90755	NA
19	90802	2
19	90803	NA
19	90804	3
19	90805	2
19	90806	NA
19	90807	NA
19	90808	NA
19	90810	NA
19	90813	NA
19	90814	NA
19	90815	NA

SIGNATURES		
Authorized Representative - County Board of Supervisors	Telephone Number	Date
Authorized Representative - County Superintendent of Schools	Telephone Number	Date
<i>Cirtino Delgado</i>	562 922-8945	2-1-12
Local Child Care Planning Council Chairperson	Telephone Number	Date
<i>K. Howell by L. Espinoza</i>	213 385-2977	3-5-12

Los Angeles County General Child Care and Development Priorities

FY 2011-2012

All zip codes for the County are listed and given a corresponding Local Planning Committee (LPC) priority ranking of 1, 2, or 3. All remaining (listed) zip codes are given NO PRIORITY and WILL NOT BE FUNDED. Please indicate those **No priority** zip codes with "NA".

County Number	ZIP CODE	LPC
SPA 1		
19	92397	NA
19	93243	NA
19	93510	NA
19	93523	NA
19	93532	NA
19	93534	2
19	93535	2
19	93536	NA
19	93543	NA
19	93544	NA
19	93550	1
19	93551	NA
19	93552	NA
19	93553	NA
19	93563	NA
19	93591	NA
SPA 2		
19	90290	NA
19	91011	NA
19	91020	NA
19	91040	NA
19	91042	NA
19	91046	NA
19	91201	NA
19	91202	NA
19	91203	NA
19	91204	NA
19	91205	2
19	91206	NA
19	91207	NA
19	91208	NA
19	91214	NA
19	91210	NA
19	91301	NA
19	91302	NA
19	91303	3
19	91304	1
19	91306	2
19	91307	NA
19	91311	NA
19	91316	NA

ATTACHMENT II

19	91321	2
19	91324	3
19	91325	NA
19	91326	NA
19	91330	NA
19	91331	NA
19	91335	2
19	91340	NA
19	91342	2
19	91343	2
19	91344	NA
19	91345	NA
19	91350	NA
19	91351	NA
19	91352	2
19	91354	NA
19	91355	NA
19	91356	3
19	91361	NA
19	91362	NA
19	91364	NA
19	91367	NA
19	91381	NA
19	91382	NA
19	91384	NA
19	91387	NA
19	91390	NA
19	91401	2
19	91402	1
19	91403	NA
19	91405	1
19	91406	2
19	91411	NA
19	91423	NA
19	91436	NA
19	91501	NA
19	91502	NA
19	91504	NA
19	91505	NA
19	91506	NA
19	91521	NA
19	91522	NA
19	91523	NA
19	91601	2
19	91602	NA
19	91604	NA
19	91605	2
19	91606	2
19	91607	NA
19	91608	NA

SPA 3

19	91001	NA
19	91006	NA
19	91007	NA
19	91010	NA
19	91011	NA
19	91016	2
19	91023	NA
19	91024	NA
19	91030	NA
19	91042	NA
19	91101	NA
19	91103	2
19	91104	3
19	91105	NA
19	91106	NA
19	91107	NA
19	91108	NA
19	91125	NA
19	91126	NA
19	91214	NA
19	91702	2
19	91706	1
19	91709	NA
19	91710	NA
19	91711	NA
19	91722	3
19	91723	3
19	91724	NA
19	91731	NA
19	91732	1
19	91733	1
19	91740	NA
19	91741	NA
19	91744	2
19	91745	3
19	91746	NA
19	91748	NA
19	91750	NA
19	91754	NA
19	91755	NA
19	91759	NA
19	91763	NA
19	91765	NA
19	91766	1
19	91767	2
19	91768	2
19	91770	2
19	91773	NA
19	91775	NA
19	91776	2

19	91780	3
19	91786	NA
19	91789	NA
19	91790	NA
19	91791	NA
19	91792	3
19	91801	2
19	91803	3

SPA 4

19	90004	2
19	90005	3
19	90006	1
19	90010	NA
19	90012	NA
19	90013	NA
19	90014	NA
19	90015	NA
19	90017	2
19	90019	1
19	90020	1
19	90021	NA
19	90023	3
19	90026	2
19	90027	2
19	90028	NA
19	90029	2
19	90031	3
19	90032	3
19	90033	NA
19	90036	NA
19	90038	3
19	90039	NA
19	90041	NA
19	90042	NA
19	90046	NA
19	90048	NA
19	90057	1
19	90065	2
19	90068	NA
19	90069	NA

SPA 5

19	90024	NA
19	90025	NA
19	90034	2
19	90035	NA
19	90045	NA
19	90049	NA
19	90056	NA
19	90064	NA
19	90066	NA
19	90067	NA

19	90077	NA
19	90094	NA
19	90095	NA
19	90210	NA
19	90211	NA
19	90212	NA
19	90230	Na
19	90232	NA
19	90265	NA
19	90272	NA
19	90291	NA
19	90292	NA
19	90293	NA
19	90401	NA
19	90402	NA
19	90403	NA
19	90404	NA
19	90405	NA

SPA 6

19	90001	1
19	90002	2
19	90003	3
19	90007	2
19	90008	NA
19	90011	1
19	90016	3
19	90018	2
19	90037	2
19	90043	NA
19	90044	1
19	90047	NA
19	90058	NA
19	90059	NA
19	90061	NA
19	90062	2
19	90089	NA
19	90220	3
19	90221	1
19	90222	2
19	90262	1
19	90723	1

SPA 7

19	90022	1
19	90040	NA
19	90063	1
19	90201	1
19	90240	NA
19	90241	1
19	90242	2
19	90255	1
19	90270	2

19	90280	1
19	90601	NA
19	90602	2
19	90603	NA
19	90604	NA
19	90605	2
19	90606	NA
19	90623	NA
19	90630	NA
19	90631	NA
19	90638	NA
19	90639	NA
19	90640	1
19	90650	1
19	90660	2
19	90670	NA
19	90701	NA
19	90703	NA
19	90706	1
19	90712	NA
19	90713	NA
19	90715	NA
19	90716	3

SPA 8

19	90245	NA
19	90247	3
19	90248	NA
19	90249	NA
19	90250	1
19	90254	NA
19	90260	NA
19	90266	NA
19	90274	NA
19	90275	NA
19	90277	NA
19	90278	NA
19	90301	2
19	90302	2
19	90303	3
19	90304	3
19	90305	NA
19	90501	2
19	90502	NA
19	90503	NA
19	90504	2
19	90505	NA
19	90506	NA
19	90704	NA
19	90710	NA
19	90717	NA

19	90731	2
19	90732	NA
19	90744	2
19	90745	NA
19	90746	NA
19	90755	NA
19	90802	2
19	90803	NA
19	90804	2
19	90805	1
19	90806	2
19	90807	NA
19	90808	NA
19	90810	2
19	90813	1
19	90814	NA
19	90815	NA

SIGNATURES		
Authorized Representative - County Board of Supervisors	Telephone Number	Date
Authorized Representative - County Superintendent of Schools	Telephone Number	Date
<i>Arturo Delgado</i>	562 922-8945	2-1-12
Local Child Care Planning Council Chairperson	Telephone Number	Date
<i>K. Howell L. Exel</i>	213 385-2977	3-5-12

January 10, 2012

To: The Los Angeles County Child Care Planning Committee
From: Arturo Delgado, Ed. D , Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools
Subject: 2011 Child Care and Development Needs Assessment Report and
The New Priorities Report

As the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, I hereby endorse the 2011 Child Care and Development Needs Assessment Report and the Priorities Report.

Signature Arturo Delgado Date 2-1-12
Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools
